







Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

MOSHEIM'S
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

VOL. III.

152

LONDON

PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.

NEW-STREET SQUARE

667

INSTITUTES
OF
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,
ANCIENT AND MODERN.

BY
JOHN LAURENCE VON MOSHEIM, D.D.

CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GÖTTINGEN.

A LITERAL TRANSLATION FROM THE ORIGINAL LATIN, WITH COPIOUS ADDITIONAL
NOTES, ORIGINAL AND SELECTED, BY

JAMES MURDOCK, D.D.

AND

HENRY SOAMES, M.A.

CHANCELLOR OF ST. PAUL'S CATHEDRAL.

EDITED, AND BROUGHT DOWN TO THE PRESENT TIME, BY

WILLIAM STUBBS, M.A.

VICAR OF NAVESTOCK, AND LIBRARIAN TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY;
LATE FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, OXFORD.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. III.

LONDON:

LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, ROBERTS, & GREEN; SIMPKIN & Co.; HAMILTON & Co.;
WHITTAKER & Co.; J. & F. H. RIVINGTON; HATCHARD & Co.; SMITH, ELDER, & Co.;
T. & W. BOONE; E. HODGSON; BAGSTER & SONS; HOULSTON & WRIGHT; TEGG &
Co.; WILLIS & SOTHERAN; NISBET & Co.; J. CORNISH; J. SNOW; BICKERS & SON;
STEVENS, SONS, & HAYNES; A. HALL & Co.; VIRTUE BROTHERS & Co.; J. & C.
MOZLEY; ROUTLEDGE & Co.; H. CLEAVER; W. ALLAN & Co.; J. H. & J. PARKER;
W. E. OLIVER; AND E. BUMPUS.

1863.

GEORGE E. MAYCOCK

CONTENTS

OF

THE THIRD VOLUME.

CENTURY XVI.

(Continued from the Second Volume.)

	PAGE		PAGE
General character of the Reformed Church	3	Calvin's contest with the immorality of Geneva	40
Different sacramental doctrines of the Lutherans and Reformed	6	Calvin's dogmatic controversies	41
Calvin's view of the sacramental presence	7	Bernardin Ochin	42
Controversy on the Divine decrees	8	Neutrality of continental Calvinists in the English disputes	ib.
Internal state of the Reformed church	9	Early success of queen Elizabeth's religious policy	44
The Ubiquitarian controversy	10	Statutes against popery	46
Calvin at Geneva	11	The Romish seminaries abroad	47
His ecclesiastical polity	12	Arrival of the Jesuits in England	48
His doctrines	13	First Puritanical movements	49
Degree of his success	ib.	The vesture controversy	50
Establishment of Calvinism in the Palatinate	14	The puritanical separation	51
French Protestantism	15	The disciplinary controversy	52
Scottish Protestantism	16	Cartwright	53
English Protestantism	18	Brownism, or independency	54
The Puritans	19	Barrowism	55
The Brownists	23	Doctrinal puritanism	ib.
Belgie Protestantism	25	The Sabbatarian controversy	56
Polish Protestantism	ib.	Religious firmness of the queen	57
Moravianism	26	Puritanical bias of her ministers and favourites	ib.
Protestantism in Hungary and Transylvania	28	Archbishop Parker	58
Defection of German Lutherans to Calvinism	ib.	Archbishop Grindal	59
Differences between the Swiss and other Reformed churches	29	Archbishop Whitgift	ib.
Scripture the sole rule of faith among the Reformed	30	Religious persecution under Elizabeth	60
Differences between Calvinists and Lutherans	31	Unsettled state of Scotland	63
The supremacy	32	Indigence of the presbyterian clergy	65
Presbyterian polity	35	Convention of Leith	66
Calvinistic discipline	36	Confirmation of it at Perth	67
Calvinistic encouragement of philosophy and criticism	37	Reasons assigned for the Leith agreement	68
Calvinistic dogmatic theology	38	Death of Knox	72
Calvinistic political and moral philosophy	39	The Leith agreement undermined	74
The sect of the Libertines	40	Andrew Melville	ib.
		The <i>Second Book of Discipline</i>	75
		First approaches towards presbyterianism	77
		Archbishop Adamson	79
		Episcopacy abolished by the general assembly	80

CENTURY XVI. (*continued*).

	PAGE		PAGE
Clamour against popery	81	Rebellion of Hugh O'Neil	131
Extirpation of episcopacy decreed at Dundee	82	Foundation of Trinity College, Dublin	135
Appointment of Montgomery to the see of Glasgow	83	Ussher's acceptance of the Jesuits' chal- lenge	ib.
The Raid of Ruthven	85	Obscure origin of the Anabaptists	136
Escape of the king	86	Their probable origin	138
Presbyterian <i>declinature</i>	88	Their first movements	139
Legislative resistance to presbyterian encroachments	ib.	Their progress	140
Improved prospects of presbyterianism	90	Their persecutions	142
Continued resistance of the court	ib.	Outrages at Münster	143
The <i>Second Book of Discipline</i> partially admitted	92	Menno Simonis	144
The Act of Annexation	ib.	Mennonite doctrines	146
County members established in the Scottish legislature	93	Mennonite schism	148
The king's marriage	95	Mennonite formularies	149
His favourable treatment of presbyte- rianism	ib.	Principal distinctions of the Mennonites	151
Archbishop Adamson's death	97	Their austerity	152
Presbyterianism legally established	98	Their prejudice against literature	154
Romish movements	ib.	Their settlement in the Dutch terri- tories	155
Tumult at Edinburgh	99	English Baptists	156
Assemblies of Perth and Dundee	100	The general and particular Baptists	157
Qualified revival of prelaacy	103	David George	159
Arrangement at Falkland	104	The family of love	ib.
The king's literary works	ib.	Name and origin of the Socinians	160
The assembly of Montrose	107	Their first beginnings	162
Ireland from Henry II. to the Reforma- tion	108	Servetus	163
Irish ecclesiastical affairs under Henry VIII.	111	His doctrines	164
Under Edward VI.	113	Other Antitrinitarians	166
Under Mary	114	Erroneous origin assigned to Socinian- ism	167
Imposition at Christ-church, Dublin	116	Real origin	169
Acts of supremacy and uniformity	118	Progress	ib.
Immediate consequences of these acts	120	Summary view of its doctrines	171
Rebellion of John O'Neil	121	Proceedings of Faustus Socinus	174
Uneasiness of Munster	124	Socinianism remodelled under his direc- tion	ib.
Foreign interference in Irish affairs	125	Propagated in Transylvania and Hun- gary	175
Preparations for an invasion under Stukeley	127	In Holland and other countries	176
Papal invasion	128	Its fundamental principles	177
Rebellion of Desmond	130	Leading articles of its theology	178
		The Racovian catechism	179
		Socinian scholarship	ib.
		Socinian controversies	180
		The Farnovians	182

CENTURY XVII.

Romish congregation <i>de propaganda</i> <i>Fide</i>	183	This largely attributed to unworthy artifices of the Jesuits	192
Romish college for propagating the faith	184	They are accused of blending paganism with Christianity	193
French congregation of priests for foreign missions	185	Chinese views of the Deity	194
Romish missionaries	ib.	Chinese veneration for the dead	195
Suspensions entertained of the Jesuits	186	Romish missions to Japan	196
Their compliances with the prejudices of their converts	ib.	Severe persecution in Japan	198
Romanism propagated in India	187	Missionary movements among the Lu- therans	199
Ineffectual attempt to spread it in Siam	189	English society for the propagation of the Gospel	ib.
Its success in China	191	Dutch missions	200

CENTURY XVII. (*continued*).

	PAGE		PAGE
Romish missions to Africa	201	Jesuitic perversions of morality	270
Romish missions in America	ib.	Romish exertions against scriptural knowledge	272
Settlement of New England	203	Diversities of Romish theological study	273
Society for the propagation of the Gospel	205	Romish controversies	274
Foundation of Boyle's lectures	206	Molina	ib.
Prevalence of scepticism	207	Jansenius	276
Infidelity on the continent	209	The Jansenist controversy	ib.
General advance in intellectual pursuits	212	Papal condemnation of Jansenism	279
Decline of religious prejudice	214	Papal compromise with the Jansenists	281
Philological and moral studies	215	Moral severity and practical piety of the Jansenists	282
Peripatetics and Rosicrucians	216	The convent of Port Royal	285
Gassendi	218	Renewed contests on the immaculate conception	286
Des Cartes	219	Quietists	288
Revival of the Platonic philosophy	220	Controversy between Bossuet and Fenelon	290
The metaphysical and the mathematical sects	221	Minor Romish controversies	291
Malebranche and Leibnitz	222	Canonisations	293
British patronage of the mathematical philosophy	223	State of the Greek church	ib.
Eclectics and sceptics	224	Cyrillus Lucaris	295
Popes of the seventeenth century	225	Romish influence upon Greek theology	297
Exertions to suppress protestantism	229	The Greek church in Russia	298
Commutations in Austria and Bohemia	ib.	Revolution in it	299
Frederick, elector Palatine, chosen king of Bohemia	230	The Monophysites	300
Imperial successes against protestantism	ib.	The Armenians	302
Gustavus Adolphus	232	The Nestorians	303
The peace of Westphalia	233	Adverse events in the Lutheran church	305
Cessation of Romish wars	ib.	Secession of Hesse	ib.
Opponents of Romanism banished from Spain and France	235	Secession of Brandenburg	306
Religious movements in the British isles	ib.	Attempted union between Lutherans and Calvinists	307
Pacific exertions of the Romish church	237	Decree of Charenton	308
Attempts at reconciliation	238	Conference of Leipsic	309
Papal methodists	242	Conferences of Thorn and Cassel	ib.
Protestant apostasy	244	Pacific exertions of Duræus	310
Papal reverses in the East	246	John Matthiæ and George Calixtus	311
Decline of papal authority	249	External advantages of the Lutherans	312
The Venetian interdict	ib.	Literature everywhere cultivated	ib.
Papal differences with Portugal	250	State of philosophy	313
French attacks upon the papal court	251	Increased liberty in philosophizing	314
Convention of Paris for the Gallican liberties	254	Excellences and defects of the teachers	315
Papal contest on the French ambassador's right of asylum	255	Faults of the times	316
General corruption of the Romish clergy	ib.	Ecclesiastical government	317
Division of monks into reformed and unreformed	256	Eminent Lutheran writers	ib.
French congregation of St. Maur	257	Modern Lutherans more tolerant than ancient	319
Port Royal and La Trappe	259	Biblical studies of the Lutherans	320
Oratory of the Holy Jesus	260	Lutheran theology	321
Priests of the Missions, and Sisters of Charity	261	Lutheran moral philosophy	322
Attacks upon the Jesuits	ib.	Lutheran controversies	ib.
Progress of learning and science	262	George Calixtus	323
Literary services of the Jesuits	264	Paper wars occasioned by him	325
Literary services of the Benedictines	ib.	Principal charges against him	326
Literary services of the Jansenists	266	Parties raised by his writings	328
Eminent Romish scholars	ib.	Moderation of the Jena divines	ib.
Continuance of doctrinal corruption among Romanists	270	Pietistic controversies	329
		Biblical colleges	331
		Fanatical movements among Lutherans	333
		Division of opinion among them	334

CENTURY XVII. (*continued*).

	PAGE		PAGE
Contest on the religious value of human learning	335	The Long Parliament	400
Contest on the value of ascetic restrictions	336	Cromwell	401
Pietistic views of ecclesiastical history	ib.	Ecclesiastical affairs in Ireland	402
Raillery employed against Lutheranism	338	The Savoy Conference	404
Millenarian doctrines revived	ib.	Restoration of protestant episcopacy in Ireland	406
Attacks upon confession and the illimitable mercy of God	339	Self-taxation relinquished by the English clergy	407
Controversy on the humiliation of Christ	340	Penal religious acts under Charles II.	408
Controversy on the operation of grace	341	James II.	410
Minor controversies	342	The Toleration Act	414
Jacob Boehmen	344	Ineffectual attempt at a comprehension	415
Pretended prophets	ib.	Overthrow of established protestant episcopacy in Scotland	417
Evils of mystical reading	345	Bill of Rights and Act of Settlement	418
Attacks upon the Lutheran church	ib.	The name of Arminians	420
Semi-Judaizers	346	Their origin	ib.
Enlargement of the Reformed church	347	Their progress	421
Reverses of the French protestants	348	The Five Points	422
Persecution of that body	ib.	Determination to suppress the Arminian party	423
Revocation of the Edict of Nantes	349	Opinion of the synod of Dort	426
Persecutions of the Waldenses and Palatines	350	Condition after the synod of Dort	427
State of learning and philosophy	ib.	Recalled from exile	428
Biblical interpretation	351	Early and later theology of the Arminians	429
Dogmatic theology	352	Its aim and principal heads	430
Moral philosophy	353	Their confession of faith	431
Predestinarian doctrines	ib.	Present state of the Arminians	432
The synod of Dort	355	Origin of the Quakers	433
Little regard paid to its decrees	ib.	First movements of the sect under Cromwell	435
Moderation of the Gallic church	356	Progress under Charles II. and James II.	436
Modification of the predestinarian hypothesis	357	Propagation out of England	438
The doctrine of imputed sin	358	Their controversies	ib.
Approaches to a reconciliation with Rome	359	Their religion generally	440
The doctrine of original sin	360	First principle	441
Dutch synods upon this doctrine	361	Its consequences	442
Dissensions in the English church	362	Concerning Christ	443
Archbishop Laud and his contemporaries	365	Discipline and worship	444
The Independents	366	Moral doctrines	ib.
Various sects	372	Form of government	445
The Antinomians	378	Supplement relating to their doctrines and discipline	446
The Latitudinarians	379	Adverse and prosperous circumstances of the Mennonites	456
The restoration	380	Union established among them	ib.
Non-jurors	381	Sects of the Anabaptists	457
Their peculiar opinions	382	External form of the Mennonite church	ib.
Controversies in Holland	383	The Uckewallists	ib.
Cocceius	ib.	The Waterlanders	458
Roel	387	The Galenians and Apostoolians	459
Becker	388	Flourishing state of the Socinians	461
Minor Dutch sects	390	Socinians at Altorf	ib.
Swiss protestantism	391	Adversities of the Polish Socinians	462
Anarch-priest appointed among English Romanists	392	Fate of the exiles	463
Primacy of archbishop Bancroft	393	The Arians	464
English concurrence in the synod of Dort	394	The Collegiants	465
The Lambeth Articles admitted in Ireland	395	The Labadists	467
Progress of puritanism under Charles I.	396	Bourignon and Poiret	468
Ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland	398	The Philadelphian Society	469

CENTURY XVIII.

	PAGE		PAGE
Prosperous events of the church . . .	471	Reforms of the emperor Joseph II. . .	491
The Jesuits in China	472	Reforms in Tuscany	492
Protestant missions	473	Decline of Romanism in France . . .	493
Adverse events	ib.	Overthrow of all religion there . . .	495
Atheists and Deists	474	Reaction in its favour	496
Romish pontiffs	ib.	Ruin of the pope's temporal power . .	497
Illusive prospects of agreement between protestants and papists	475	English intolerance to protestants ended under George I.	ib.
Jansenist contests	476	The convocation reduced to inactivity .	500
The bull <i>Unigenitus</i>	ib.	Prevalence of infidelity and licentious- ness	502
Commutations from it in France . . .	ib.	Wesley and the Arminian methodists .	503
Supports of Jansenism in France . . .	477	Whitefield and the Calvinistic metho- dists	507
State of the Eastern church	ib.	Differences between the two leaders . .	509
External state of the Lutheran church .	478	The countess of Huntingdon	510
Internal state	ib.	Rise of an anti-trinitarian sect in Eng- land	512
Intestine foes	479	Application to parliament for relief from subscription	514
The Herrenhutters	ib.	This relief granted to dissenting minis- ters	515
Cultivation of philosophy among the Lutherans	480	Attempt at a comprehension	516
The Wertheim translation	481	Ineffectual applications for a relief from the Corporation and Test Acts . . .	ib.
Pietistic controversies	ib.	English Romanists relieved from some of the severest penal enactments . .	518
State of the reformed church	ib.	Toleration granted to them	520
Projects of union between the Lutherans and Reformed	482	Relief granted to Irish Romanists . . .	522
State of the English church	ib.	And to the Scottish	523
Various sects in England	483	Relief granted to Scottish protestant episcopalians	524
State of the Dutch church	484	The American church	528
Swiss controversy on the <i>Formula Con- sensus</i>	ib.	The Dissidents, and the partition of Poland	532
The Socinians and Arians	485		
Events disadvantageous to Romanism .	486		
Expulsion of the Jesuits from Portugal	487		
Their order suppressed in France . . .	488		
Regularly suppressed by the pope . . .	489		
Still patronised by Prussia and Russia	490		

CENTURY XIX.

Re-establishment of religion in France .	535	Roman Catholic church	574
Renewed observance of Sunday	537	Foreign protestants	587
Opposition to the French <i>Concordat</i> . .	538	English church	602
Papal coronation of Napoleon	539	Scotch church	623
Overthrow of the pope's temporal power	541	Irish church	624
Restoration of the Jesuits	543	American church	624
Papal arrangements on the French restoration	545	Scotch presbyterianism	625
Movements in England to remove Romish disabilities	ib.	Conclusion	627
Opposition to this removal	547	COUNCILS	629
Formation of the Catholic Association .	549	POPEs	ib.
Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts	550	ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY	630
Removal of Romish disabilities	551	ARCHBISHOPS OF ARMAGH	631
Cautionary provisions	554	ARCHBISHOPS OF ST. ANDREW'S . . .	632
The last thirty years	562	APPENDIX (Movement towards an union between the Anglican and Gallican churches, under archbishop Wake) . .	633
Eastern church	565	VATER'S TABLES	659
		INDEX	697

INSTITUTES
OF
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
UNDER THE
NEW TESTAMENT.

BOOK IV.

EMBRACING EVENTS FROM THE COMMENCEMENT
OF
THE REFORMATION BY LUTHER
TO
A.D. 1700.

SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

SECT. III. PART II.

(Continued.)

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE REFORMED CHURCH.

§ 1. General character of the Reformed church—§ 2. Causes of this character—
§ 3. Origin of this church—§ 4. Zwinglian contests respecting the Lord's Supper—
§ 5. History of them, till Luther's death—§ 6. Transactions after his death—
§ 7. Controversy respecting predestination—§ 8. The height of it—§ 9. Two periods
in the early history of this church—§ 10. Points of difference between the Swiss and
the Lutherans—§ 11. John Calvin a principal founder of this church—§ 12. The
doctrine and discipline inculcated by Calvin—§ 13. All the Reformed did not embrace
his views—§ 14. Progress of this church in Germany—§ 15. Progress in France—
§ 16. Progress in England and Scotland—§ 17. Rise of the Puritans—§§ 18, 19.
Their opinions—§ 20. Their fundamental principles—§ 21. Sects among them.
Brownists—§ 22. The Dutch Reformed church—§ 23. Reformed church of Poland—
§ 24. The Bohemian Brethren—§ 25. Waldensians: Hungarians: Transylvanians—
§ 26. Churches which joined the Reformed—§ 27. Diversity among the Reformed—
§ 28. Their doctrines—§ 29. Their dissent from the Lutherans—§ 30. Importance
of the difference—§ 31. Ecclesiastical power—§ 32. Organisation of the church—
§ 33. Church discipline—§ 34. State of learning—§ 35. Biblical expositors—
§ 36. Dogmatic theology—§ 37. Practical theology—§ 38. Calvin's contest with
the spiritual libertines—§ 39. His contests with the Genevans—§ 40. Castalio—
§ 41. Bolsec—§ 42. Ochin—§§ 43, 44. Controversy between the Puritans and the
Episcopalians.

§ 1. THE church which wishes to be called the *Reformed*, or the
Evangelical Reformed church, but which was formerly known to its
opponents as the *Zwinglian* or the *Calvinistic* church, and is now
called by many the *Calvinistic Reformed*,¹ differs in character from

¹ [In England and America, the term *Reformed* is commonly applied to all the different sects, which, in this century, separated from the Roman church: and the term *Protestant* is used with the same latitude. But the Lutheran writers use the term *Reformed*, to denote all the larger sects, except their own, which separated from the Roman church during this cen-

ture. In this sense Mosheim here uses it. It would have been more accurate, however, had he said the *Reformed Churches*; for the sects he includes, do not pretend to be *one church*, or *one sect*. They are, and they profess to be, as distinct from each other, as any or all of them are from the Lutheran church. See the following note. *Tr.*]

nearly all others. For all other Christian churches are united by a certain common bond of doctrine and discipline: but this is not the case with the *Reformed church*. It has not one form of religion, but various forms not slightly differing in some things, nor does it follow one uniform rule of divine worship, nor finally is it governed everywhere in the same way. Of course, this church does not require of its ministers, that they should all hold and teach the same things; but allows very many points of doctrine, and those of no little consequence, to be variously stated and explained, provided the great first principles of religion and piety remain inviolate. This church may, therefore, be called a great community, made up of various kinds of churches; which the moderation of all, in tolerating dissent, keeps from splitting into different sects.¹

§ 2. Such was not the original character of this church; but it was thrown into this state by the force of circumstances. The Swiss, with whom it originated, and especially *John Calvin*, who was the second father of it, spared no pains to bring all the congregations that united with them, to adopt the same forms of faith and practice, and the same mode of government; and while they looked upon the Lutherans as brethren that were in error, they were not disposed to grant indulgence and impunity themselves, nor were they willing their associates should grant it, to those who openly favoured the Lutheran views of the Lord's Supper, the person of Christ, predestination, and the kindred subjects. But when fierce contests arose in Britain, both respecting the form of church government, and respecting rites, and some other subjects, between what were called the *Episcopalians* and the *Puritans*, it seemed necessary to extend the church's boundaries, and to reckon among genuine brethren even such as deviated from

¹ [These observations are designed to give the Lutheran church an air of *unity*, which is not to be found in the *Reformed*. But there is a real fallacy in this specious representation of things. The *Reformed church*, when considered in the true extent of the term *Reformed*, comprehends all those religious communities that separated themselves from the church of *Rome*, and, in this sense, includes the Lutheran church as well as the others. And even when this epithet is used in opposition to the community founded by Luther, it represents, not a single church, as the Episcopal, Presbyterian, or Independent, but rather a *collection of churches*; which, though they be invisibly united by a belief and profession of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, yet frequent separate places of worship, and have each a visible centre of external union peculiar to themselves, which is formed by certain peculiarities in their respective rules of public worship and ecclesiastical government. An attentive examination of the discipline, polity, and worship of the churches of *England*, *Scot-*

land, *Holland*, and *Switzerland*, will set this matter in the clearest light. The first of these churches, being governed by *bishops*, and not admitting the validity of *presbyterian ordination*, differs from the other three, more than any of these differ from each other. There are, however, peculiarities of government and worship, that distinguish the church of *Holland* from that of *Scotland*. The institution of *deacons*, the use of *forms* for the celebration of the sacraments, and ordinary *form of prayer*, the observation of the *festivals* of Christmas, Easter, Ascension-day, and Whitsuntide, are established in the Dutch church; and it is well known that the church of *Scotland* differs from it extremely in these respects. But after all, to what does the pretended uniformity among the Lutherans amount? are not some of the Lutheran churches governed by bishops, while others are ruled by elders? It shall, moreover, be shown, in its proper place, that, even in point of doctrine, the Lutheran churches are not so very remarkable for their uniformity.' *Maccl.*]

the opinions and the regulations of the Genevans. And after the Synod of Dort, much greater moderation ensued. For, although the opinions of the Arminians were rejected and condemned, they found their way into the minds of great numbers. The English church, in the time of *Charles I.*, publicly renounced the opinions of *Calvin* respecting the divine decrees;¹ and studied entire conformity with the opinions and practices of the first ages of Christianity. Some German churches dared not publicly assent entirely to the Genevan views, lest they should be declared to have cut themselves off from the privileges of the Augsburg Confession. Finally, the French exiles, who had long been accustomed to milder views, and had philosophized in the free manner of their countrymen, having become dispersed over the whole Reformed world, allured many to emulate them, by their eloquence and their talents. All these and some other circumstances have gradually instilled such a spirit of gentleness and patience, that at the present day, all, except such as either adhere to the Roman pontiff, or fiercely defend the errors of the Socinians, Anabaptists, or Quakers, can hold their place among the members of the Reformed church. This has taken place contrary to the wishes, and against the opposition of many: but they are far out-numbered and out-influenced by the others, who think that but few things are necessary to be believed in order to salvation, who allow many doctrines to be variously explained, and who wish to extend the Reformed church as widely as possible.²

§ 3. The founder of the Reformed church was *Ulric Zwingle*, a Swiss, an acute man, and a lover of truth.³ He not only wished to have many things suppressed, in the public worship and in the churches, which *Luther* thought might be borne, images for instance, altars, candles, the formula of *exorcism*, the private⁴ confession of sins, with other things, and prescribed the most simple forms of worship; but he likewise taught, on some points of doctrine, in particular respecting the Lord's Supper, very differently from *Luther*. And those who laboured with him in banishing the popish superstitions among the Swiss, approved these singular opinions of *Zwingle*. From these men, all the churches of Switzerland, which separated from the Roman communion, received those opinions. From Switzerland, by the preaching and writings of his pupils and friends, the same tenets

¹ [Many members of the church of England, with archbishop Laud at their head, did, indeed, propagate the doctrines of *Arminius*, both in their pulpits, and in their writings. But it is not accurate to say that the *Church of England* renounced, publicly, in that reign, the opinions of *Calvin*.] *Macl.*

² There has never yet been published a full and accurate History of the Reformed church. Abraham Scultetus would have given us one, down to his times, in his *Annales Evangelii Renovati*; but only a very small part of that work has been preserved. Theodore Hasæus, who projected

Annales Ecclesiæ Reformatæ, was cut off by a premature death. James Basnage's famous work, which was last published, Rotterdam, 1725, 2 vols. 4to, entitled, *Histoire de la Religion des Eglises Réformées*, is not a history of this church, but merely shows, that the peculiar doctrines of the Reformed church are not novel, but very ancient, and have been held in all ages of the church. Lewis Maimbourg's *Histoire du Calvinisme* is filled with innumerable errors, and written with the pen of partiality.

³ See above, sec. i. c. ii. § 11, note.

⁴ [Auricular. *Tr.*]

spread among the neighbouring nations. Thus the Reformed church, of which *Zwingle* was the parent, was at first small, and of limited extent, but by degrees became an extensive body.

§ 4. The principal cause of the separation of the Lutherans from the Swiss, was *Zwingle's* doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper. While *Luther* maintained, that the body and blood of Christ are truly, though in an inexplicable manner, present in the Holy Supper, and are presented along with the bread and wine in that ordinance, *Zwingle* held, on the contrary, that the bread and wine are only signs and symbols of the absent body and blood of Christ; and he so taught in his public writings from the year 1524 onwards.¹ The next year, *John Ecolampadius*, a theologian of Bâle, and one of the most learned men of that age, did the same thing.² Both were opposed by *Luther* and his friends, and especially by the Suabians, with great firmness and resolution. *Philip*, the landgrave of Hesse, fearing much injury to the incipient cause of the *Protestants*, from these contests, endeavoured to put an end to them by a conference held at Marburg, in the year 1529, between *Zwingle*, *Luther*, and some others. But he could obtain only a truce, not a peace. *Luther* and *Zwingle* came to agreement on many points: but the controversy respecting the Lord's Supper was left for God and time to heal.³

§ 5. *Zwingle* had but just settled his church, when, in the year 1530, he fell in a battle of the Zurichers with the Roman Catholic Swiss, the defenders of the old religion. He marched out to this war, not for the purpose of fighting, but for the sake of encouraging and consoling the soldiers, though he went armed according to the customs of his country.⁴ After his death certain good and moderate men among the Lutherans, especially *Martin Bucer*, laboured with all zeal and diligence, by exhortations, explanations, admonitions, and perhaps also by shrouding the opinions of both parties in ambiguous language, to bring about a compromise of some sort.⁵ That those who undertook this difficult task had good intentions and designs, no one, who is himself honest and candid, will call in question: but whether they took the right and proper method to accomplish their object is less

¹ Yet, before that year, *Zwingle* had so believed, and taught, in private. See Dan. Gerdes, *Hist. Evangelii Renovati*, t. i. append. p. 228.

² See Jo. Conrad Fuesslin, *Centuria I. Epist. Theol. Reformatorum*, p. 31, 35, 44, 49, &c. [See also, above, sec. i. ch. ii. § 20, and notes. Tr.]

³ Abrah. Ruchat, *Histoire de la Réformation de la Suisse*, vol. i. passim, vol. ii. l. vi. p. 463, &c. Jo. Henry Hottinger's *Helvetische Kirchengeschichte*, pt. iii. l. vi. p. 27, 51, &c., p. 483. Val. Ern. Löschner, *Historia Motuum*, pt. i. c. ii. iii. p. 55, &c., c. vi. p. 143, &c. Jo. Conr. Fuesslin's *Beyträge zur Schweizer-Reformation*, iv. 120, &c. [and above, sec. i. c. ii. §§ 20 & 27. Tr.]

⁴ Those of our church, who formerly re-

proached *Zwingle*, and the Reformed church, with this death, did not consider the customs of the Swiss nation, in that age. For all the Swiss, when summoned to defend their country, were at that time obliged to march, and not even the religious teachers and ministers were excused. And in the very battle in which *Zwingle* fell, there fell likewise a doctor of Berne, Hieronymus Pontanus. See Fuesslin's *Centuria I. Epistolar. Theol. Reformat.* p. 84, &c.

⁵ See Alb. Menon. Verpoorten's *Comment. de Martino Bucero et ejus sententia de Cæna Domini*, § ix. p. 23, &c. Coburg, 1709, 8vo. Löschner's *Historia Motuum*, pt. i. l. ii. c. i. p. 181, and pt. ii. l. iii. c. ii. p. 15.

clear. In Switzerland some commotions resulted from these movements of *Bucer*. For some refused to give up the opinion of *Zwingle*, while others embraced the explanations and the modified views of *Bucer*.¹ But these commotions had no influence to bring about a peace with *Luther*. Out of Switzerland, however, and among the theologians of Upper Germany, who had adhered to the side of the Swiss, *Bucer's* efforts to settle the controversy had such effect, that, in the year 1536, they sent a deputation to Wittenberg, and connected themselves with *Luther*, abandoning the Swiss.² The Swiss he could not persuade to do so: yet for some years afterwards, the prospect of an agreement was not absolutely desperate. But when, in the year 1544, *Luther* had published his *Confession of Faith respecting the Lord's Supper*, in direct opposition to the opinions of the Swiss, the Zurichers, the year following, publicly defended their cause against him: and by these movements all the efforts of the pacificators were rendered nugatory.³

§ 6. The happy death, by which *Luther* was removed in 1546, seemed to dispel this cloud, and again inspired the hope that a compromise might take place. For *Melancthon* and his friends and disciples desired so eagerly to have the Lutherans and Zwinglians unite, that he did not refuse even a simulated peace, and showed himself in various forms for the sake of obtaining one. On the other side, *John Calvin*, a native of Noyon in France, and a teacher at Geneva, a man venerated even by his enemies for his genius, learning, eloquence, and other endowments, and moreover the friend of *Melancthon*, tempered the offensive opinion of *Zwingle*, and endeavoured to prevail with the Swiss, and especially with those of Zurich, among whom his influence was very great, to adopt his views.⁴ He rejected indeed the idea of the actual *presence* of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Supper; but he was of opinion that a certain *divine influence* from Christ accompanied the bread and wine, to those who received them with full faith and an honest heart: and to render this doctrine the more acceptable, he expressed it in nearly the same phraseology that was used by the *Lutherans* respecting that matter. It was, indeed, the common error of nearly all who assumed the office of pacificators in this contest, or who attempted to restore harmony, that they endeavoured rather to produce agreement in words than in sentiment. But neither had *Melancthon*, though extremely desirous of peace, fortitude enough openly to engage in this perilous enterprise; nor would his opponents allow him tranquillity enough, after the death of *Luther*, to collect himself, and consider from the beginning a very difficult question. Besides, the

¹ See Fuesslin's *Cent. I. Epistolar. Theolog.* p. 162, 170, 181, 182, 190, 192, 215.

² Löschner, l. c. cap. ii. p. 205. Abrah. Ruchat, *Hist. de la Réformation de la Suisse*, v. 535, &c. Hottinger's *Helvetische Kirchengesch.* vol. iii. b. vi. p. 702, &c. [See sec. i. c. iii. § 3, note. *Tr.*]

³ Löschner, l. c. pt. i. l. ii. c. iv. p. 241, &c. [This *Confession* is a different work from *Luther's Large Confession*, published in 1528. *Tr.*]

⁴ Christ. August. Salig's *Historie der Augsburg Confession*, vol. ii. b. vii. ch. iii. p. 1075.

contention which had been intermitted, was renewed in 1552, by *Joachim Westphal*, a pastor at Hamburg; than whom, after *Flacius*, there was no more strenuous vindicator of the sentiments of *Luther*. For to the *Mutual Consent of the Genevans and Zurichers, in regard to the doctrine of the Sacrament*, he opposed a book, written in the caustic style of *Luther*, entitled, *A Farrago of confused and discordant opinions respecting the sacred Supper, collected from the books of the Sacramentarians*; in which he bitterly taxed the Reformed with their disagreements on the doctrine of the Supper, and most earnestly contended for the opinion of *Luther*. In a style no less harsh, *Calvin* first replied to him: and soon after, some joining *Westphal*, and others joining *Calvin*, the parties became gradually so excited, that the contest raged even worse than before, and no human power seemed adequate to check it.¹

§ 7. To these controversies an immense accession was made, afterwards, by the contest respecting the decrees of God in relation to the eternal salvation of men; which was moved by *John Calvin*, and has an obvious tendency to engender abstruse and recondite questions. The first teachers among the Swiss were so far from the views of those who hold that God, by his supreme and absolute sovereignty, appointed some to everlasting joy, and others to everlasting pain, from all eternity, and without any regard had to their condition and conduct, that they seemed not far removed from the sentiments of the Pelagians; and did not hesitate, with *Zwingle*, to promise heaven to all who lived according to right reason.² But *Calvin*, differing from them, thought that God, according to his own arbitrament, has defined every human being's future fate, and he pronounced that an absolute decree of the Divine will is the sole cause with all men, of either everlasting felicity, or infelicity.³ This opinion was propagated by his writings and pupils, in a short time, through the whole body of the Reformed; nay, more, it was enrolled among the public doctrines of the church in some regions. The Italian, *Jerome Zanchi*, who was devoted to the views of *Calvin*, gave the first impulse to a deplorable controversy upon this question, at Strasburg, in the year 1560, and it soon afterwards assumed so many new features from the

¹ Löschner's *Hist. Motuum*, pt. ii. l. iii. c. viii. p. 83, &c. Jo. Möller's *Cimbria Litterata*, iii. 642, &c. Arnold Grevius, *Memoria Joachimi Westphali*, p. 62, 106, &c.

² See this demonstrated, by many proofs, in John Daillé's *Apologia pro duabus Ecclesiarum Gallicarum Synodis, adversus Frider. Spanhemium*, pt. iv. p. 946. Jo. Alphon. Turretin, *Epistola ad Antistitem Cantuariensem*; which is printed in the *Bibliothèque Germanique*, xiii. 92. Rich. Simon, *Bibliothèque Critique*, under the fictitious name of *Sainiore*, t. iii. c. xxviii. p. 292, 298. The author of the French notes to the *Formula Consensus Helvetica*, p. 52, &c. The very learned Daniel Gerdes, indeed, in his *Miscellanea Gröningens.* ii. 476. 477, seems to

teach the contrary; namely, that *Calvin* held the same opinions as the first teachers among the Swiss. But he may be refuted by what he himself adduces concerning the disturbances in Switzerland produced by *Calvin's* opinions.

³ [This statement appears too strong. Neither *Calvin*, nor *Augustine*, nor any other distinguished teacher of the divine decrees, in ancient times, maintained, that God's 'absolute decree is the only cause of eternal felicity and eternal misery.' On the contrary, they maintained, that the sinfulness of men is the sole cause of their eternal misery. Neither did they suppose, that the righteous are saved, without any acts or agency of their own. Tr.]

various parties engaged in it, that there is good reason for doubting, whether this difference, or the former one upon the Lord's Supper, did more for exasperating feelings, and confirming separation.¹

§ 8. All prospect of calming the passions, and of settling in some way these great contests, being at an end as respects the Swiss, the only gleam of hope was from the Saxons, the pupils and followers of *Melancthon*, who, it was well known, sought to find some method of producing harmony after the death of their instructor. But having no leader, who could see into the future, and cautiously bend to circumstances, they rendered a wound, which already seemed mortal, absolutely incurable, by their remedies. For while they endeavoured to corrupt the public teachers and the youth, or at least to induce them to tolerate the opinions of the Swiss, by publishing certain books, as has been stated, they drew ruin upon themselves and their project, and gave occasion for the formation of the noted *Formula of Concord*, which condemned the doctrines of the Reformed respecting the sacred Supper and the person of Christ. This, being received by the greatest part of the Lutherans among their rules of faith, was an insurmountable obstacle to all efforts of the pacificators.

§ 9. Thus far as to the origin, causes, and progress of the division which separates the Reformed from the Lutherans. We must next look into the internal state, the history, and the growth of the Reformed church. The history of the Reformed body, during this century, should be divided into two periods: of which the first extends from the year 1519, when *Zwingle* began to form a church, separate from the Roman community, on to the time when *John Calvin* settled at Geneva, and obtained an absolute ascendancy among the Reformed. The latter period embraces the remainder of the century. In the first period, the church, which afterwards assumed the title of *Reformed* (in imitation of their neighbours the French, who distinguished themselves from the Roman Catholics by this title), was of no great extent, being almost confined to Switzerland. Some small states, indeed, in the adjacent countries of Suabia and Alsace, as Strasburg, and a few others, adhered to the side of the Swiss:² but these, in the year 1536, by the influence of *Bucer*, abandoned the Swiss, reverted back to the Saxon community, and became reconciled with *Luther*. The other

¹ See Löscher's *Hist. Motuum*, pt. iii. l. v. c. ii. p. 27, &c. cap. x. p. 227. Salig's *Hist. der Augsburg Confession*, vol. i. b. ii. ch. xiii. p. 441, &c.

² [Among these states were, besides Strasburg, where Wolfgang Fabricius, Capito, and Martin Bucer, were entirely on Zwingle's side; Reutlingen, where the pastor Conrad Herman was of Zwingle's opinion; Constance, where Ambrose Blauer adhered to Zwingle; Augsburg, where Martin Cellarius and Wolfgang Musculus adhered to the Reformed religion; Memmingen and Lindau, which, with Strasburg

and Constance, at first refused to subscribe to the Augsburg Confession, and presented a separate one called *Tetrapolitana* (that of the four cities). But all these were persuaded by Bucer to subscribe to the Augsburg Confession, and to accept the Wittenberg agreement. In Strasburg especially, the Reformed lost all public offices, after the contests of Hieronymus Zanchius with John Marbach, John Sturm, and John Pappus; and their community at last fell to the ground. See Löscher's *Hist. Motuum*, ii. 283, &c. *Schl.*]

churches that revolted from the Roman pontiff, had either embraced openly the sentiments of *Luther*, or were composed of persons of diverse sentiments, who may be considered as of neither party. And within these narrow limits, the church collected by the efforts of *Zwingle* would perhaps have remained stationary, had not *John Calvin* arisen. For as the Swiss, contented with such things as they have, feel no desire for more extensive territories, so neither did they seem solicitous for the extension of their church.¹

§ 10. In this first age of the Reformed church, nothing else separated it from the Lutheran church, but the controversy respecting the *Lord's Supper*: out of which arose another, respecting the *person of Jesus Christ*: which, however, the whole Lutheran church never made its own controversy. For when the Suabian divines, in their disputes with the Swiss, drew an argument, in proof of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacred Supper, from the doctrine of the communication of the divine attributes (and among them *omnipresence* in particular) to the *human* nature of Christ, in consequence of the hypostatic union;² the Swiss, to meet this argument, denied the communication of the divine properties to the human nature of Christ; and opposed, in particular, the omnipresence of the *man*, Christ. Hence originated the very troublesome controversy, respecting the *communication of attributes*, and the *ubiquity*, as the Swiss termed it; which produced so many books and subtle disquisitions, and so many mutual criminations. During this period, the Swiss in general followed the opinion of *Zwingle* respecting the Lord's Supper, which differed from that of *Calvin*. For this father of the Swiss church believed, that the bread and wine only *represent* the body and blood of Christ, or are *signs* and emblems of the blessings procured for the human race by the death of Christ; and, therefore, that Christians derived no other benefit from coming to the Lord's Supper, than that of meditation on

¹ [Dr. Mosheim is still blinded by his theory of the *unity* of the Reformed church. What then? did the Reformation in England owe its birth and progress to John Calvin? or were the Dutch, or the French, sleeping on in popery, till Calvin arose? Far from it. Simultaneously, there were efforts for reformation in nearly every country of Europe. Luther and Zwingle took the lead, in their own countries; and in them the Reformation first became complete. But several other countries were not far behind; and about the time that they achieved their deliverance from the Roman yoke, John Calvin arose, and, by his superior talents and wisdom, acquired more influence than any other man of his age, among the protestants. Yet he did not so much *extend* the Reformation, as enlighten the Reformed, and contribute by his counsels to the establishment and regulation of the Reformed churches. *Th.*]

² [Especially Brentius and James Andree; the former in his *Sententia de Libello Bullingeri*, Tübingen, 1561, 4to, and still more largely, in his book, *de Personali Unione, et de Divina Majestate Christi*; as also in his *Recognitio Doctrinæ de vera Majestate Christi*, Tübingen, 1564, 4to, and Andree in his *Assertio de Persona et Unione*, 1565, 4to. Also in the Conference of Maulbronn, in 1564, this subject was much discussed; and the Tübingen divines published, in 1565, their *Declaratio et Confessio Majestatis Christi*. Christopher, duke of Württemberg, sent this production of his divines to Augustus, the elector of Saxony, and requested him to get the opinion of his divines respecting it. But these found much to set aside in this doctrine, which they regarded as novel and dangerous. See Hutter's *Concordia Concors*, p. 49, &c. 61, &c. *Schl.*].

the merits of Christ, or, as the patrons of this opinion used to express themselves, *the Lord's Supper is nothing but a memorial of Christ*.¹ *Martin Bucer*, for the sake of peace, laboured to correct and amend this doctrine of the Holy Supper, and to make it appear more like, nay, actually allied, to that of *Luther*. But the remembrance of *Zwingle* was too fresh to allow the Swiss to be drawn off from his opinion.

§ 11. The Reformed church assumed an aspect entirely new, when *John Calvin*, a Frenchman, born at Noyon—a man with whom few of his age will bear a comparison, for patient industry, resolution, hatred of the Romish superstition, eloquence, and genius—returned in 1541 to Geneva, from which he had been driven, and obtained the first place in the new church of Geneva,² and vast influence also in the republic. This man, possessing a most capacious mind, endeavoured, not only to establish and bless his beloved Geneva with the best regulations and institutions, but also to make it the mother and seminary of the whole Reformed church, that, in fact, which Wittenberg was among the Lutherans; endeavouring from it, as a centre, to enlarge and extend the Reformed church; in short, to set up Geneva as a standard and pattern for settling every member of that church. This was truly a great undertaking, and one not unworthy of a great mind; one likewise, no small part of which he actually accomplished, by his perseverance and untiring zeal. In the first place, accordingly, by his writings, his epistles, and other things, he induced very many persons of rank and fortune to emigrate from France, Italy, and other countries, and to settle at Geneva; and great numbers more to travel to Geneva merely to see and hear so great a man. In the next place, he persuaded the senate of Geneva, in 1558, to establish an academy at Geneva, in which he and his colleague *Theodore Beza*, and other men of great erudition and high reputation, were the teachers. This new academy acquired in a short time so much distinction and glory, in consequence of its teachers, that students eagerly repaired to it in great numbers, from England, Scotland, France, Italy, and Germany, in pursuit of sacred as well as civil learning. By these his pupils, *Calvin* enlarged everywhere the Reformed church, and recommended and propagated his own sentiments to more than one nation of Europe. He died in 1564: but his institutions continued vigorous after his decease; and the academy of Geneva, in particular, flourished under *Theodore Beza*, no less than under *Calvin* himself.³

¹ That this was *Zwingle's* real opinion respecting the sacred Supper, is demonstrated by numerous proofs, in the *Museum Helveticum*, i. 485, &c. 490, iii. 631. I will adduce only one short sentence from his book, *de Baptismo*, in his *Opp.* ii. 85: 'Cœna Dominica non aliud, quam commemorationis nomen meretur.' Compare, in various places, *Fuesslin's Cent. I. Epistolar. Theol. Reformatorum*, p. 255, 262, &c. [See above, sec. i. c. iii. § 3, note. *Tr.*]

² *Calvin* was, in fact, superintendent at Geneva; for he presided, till his death, over the body of the clergy, and in the *Consistory* or ecclesiastical judicatory. But when dying, he proved that it was dangerous to commit to one man perpetually an office of so much authority. See *Jac. Spon's Histoire de Genève*, ii. 111, &c. And therefore, after him, the Genevan church had no standing president.

³ The wise and vigorous conduct of *Cal-*

§ 12. The theology, taught by *Zwingle*, was altered by *Calvin*, principally in three respects. (I.) *Zwingle* assigned to civil rulers full and absolute power in regard to religious matters, and—what many censure him for—subjected the ministers of religion entirely to their authority. He moreover did not object to grades of office among religious teachers, nor to a superior over the ministers of parishes. But *Calvin* circumscribed the power of the magistrate in matters of religion, within narrow limits; and maintained, that the church ought to be free and independent, and to govern itself by means of bodies of presbyters, synods, and conventions of presbyters, in the manner of the ancient church; yet leaving to the magistrate the protection of the church, and an external care over it: in short, he introduced at Geneva, and he endeavoured to introduce throughout the Reformed church, that form of church government, which is called *Presbyterian*; for he did not allow of bishops and gradations among ministers, but maintained that, by divine appointment,¹ they ought all to be equal, and on a level with each other. Hence he established at Geneva, a judicatory or *consistory*, composed of *ruling elders* or *lay presbyters*, and *teaching elders*; and assigned to it great power. He also established conventions or synods: and in these consistories and synods, caused laws to be enacted relating to religious matters.

vin, in the church and in the republic of Geneva, is elucidated with many documents never before published, by the learned man who republished, with enlargements, Jac. Spon's *Hist. de Genève*, 1730, 4to and 8vo. See t. ii. 87, &c. 100, &c. and other passages. [Calvin was not the first reformer of Geneva, but William Farel, a zealous clergyman of Dauphiné, who preached the Gospel with acceptance as early as 1532, but was driven from the city by the instigation of the bishop. His successor, Anthony Froment, met the same fate. But as the internal state of the city became changed, and the council, which had hitherto been on the side of the bishop, abandoned him, and he left the city in 1533, the two preachers were recalled; and they, in connexion with a third, Peter Viret, gathered a numerous church in Geneva; so that in 1535, the Reformation became supported by the council. Yet the full organisation and establishment of the church was the work of John Calvin. He was born in 1509; and in his studies, connected law with theology, studying the former at the command of his father, and the latter from his own choice; and from Melchior Volmar, a German, and professor of Greek at Bourges, he acquired a knowledge of the evangelical doctrines. After the death of his father, he devoted himself wholly to theology, and publicly professed the reformed doctrine, which he spread in France, with all diligence. His name soon became known in Switzerland as well as France: and Farel and Viret besought him, as he was travelling through

Geneva, to remain there, and aid them in setting up the new church. But in 1538, great dissension arose in Geneva; and Calvin and Farel severely inveighed from the pulpit against the conduct of the council, which resolved to introduce the ceremonies agreed on at Bern, in the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper, and to reject those which these ministers wished to have adopted; and the consequence was, that Calvin and Farel were banished from the republic. Calvin now spent a considerable time, as a preacher and a professor, at Strasburg; where he lived in great intimacy with Bucer and Capito, and with them very strenuously defended the cause of the protestants in Germany both orally and in his writings. But in 1541, at the repeated and pressing invitations of the Genevans, he returned to them again, and there officiated with great perseverance, zeal, prudence, and disinterestedness, till his death, in 1564. His great talents and virtues were shaded by the love of power, by a want of tenderness, and by passionate rigour against the erring. His works have been published in nine volumes, folio: among which his *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, and his exegetical writings, are most valued. *Schl.*—His life was written by Beza, and is prefixed to his Letters. See also Middleton's *Evangelical Biography*, i. 1, &c. E. Waterman's *Memoirs of John Calvin*, Hartford, 1813, 8vo; and Bayle's *Dictionary*, art. *Calvin*. *Tr.*]

¹ Jure divino.

He also, among other things, reinstated the ancient discipline by which offenders were excluded from the church. All these things took place with the consent of the greater part of the senate. (II.) To facilitate a pacification with the Lutherans, he substituted, in place of the Zwinglian doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper, another doctrine in appearance more like that of *Luther*, indeed not greatly differing from it. For while *Zwingle* admitted only a *symbolical* presence of the body and blood of Christ, in the Sacred Supper, and promised no other benefit from its celebration, than a remembrance of Christ's death, and of the benefits obtained by that death, *Calvin* admitted a sort of *spiritual presence*; that is, he held that individuals, possessed of faith and regenerate, are also united in a certain way to the man Christ, and from this union receive an increase of spiritual life. And as he used the phraseology of *Luther* on this subject, and acknowledged, among other things, that *divine grace was conferred and sealed*, by the sacred Supper, he was thought by many to believe in what is called *impanation*, and to be very near the *Lutherans*.¹ According to *Zwingle's* opinion, all Christians whatsoever, whether regenerate or in their sins, can be partakers of the body and blood of Christ; but according to *Calvin*, none can except the regenerate and the holy. (III.) The celebrated doctrine of an *absolute decree* of God respecting the salvation of men, which was unknown to *Zwingle*, was inculcated by *Calvin*: that is, he taught that God had no other ground for his electing some persons from all eternity to everlasting life, and appointing others to everlasting punishments, than his own pleasure, or his most free and sovereign will.

§ 13. The first of these three doctrines, neither *Calvin* nor his disciples could persuade all the Reformed churches to adopt; for instance, the Germans, the English, or even the Swiss: yet he persuaded the French, the Dutch, the Scotch, and some others. The Swiss would not all consent to allow the form of church government established by *Zwingle*, and the prerogatives of the magistrates in matters of religion, to be changed. On the two other points there

¹ See Fuesslin's *Cent. I. Epistolar. Theolog. Reformator*. i. 255, 260, 262, 263, &c. *Lettres de Calvin à M. Jac. de Fulaise*, published a few years since at Amsterdam, p. 84, 85. Calvin himself wrote to Bucer (in Fuesslin, l. c. p. 263) that he approved of his sentiment. Perhaps he received his own opinion from Bucer. See Jac. Benign. Bossuet's *Hist. des Variations des Eglises Protestantes*, ii. 8, &c. 14, 19. Courayer's *Examen des Défauts des Théologiens*, ii. 72, &c., who endeavours to show that Calvin's sentiments respecting the Lord's Supper were nearly the same as those of the Roman Catholics. But he is in general very obscure on the subject, and does not express himself uniformly, so that it is difficult to ascertain his real opinion. ['The term *Impanation* (which signifies here the

presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist, *in* or *with* the *bread*, that is there exhibited) amounts to what is called *Consubstantiation*. The modern Lutherans are grown somewhat wiser in this respect; at least, they seem less zealous than their ancestors about the tenet in question.' *Macl.*—Thus Brettschneider writes, in 1819 (*Entwicklung*, &c. p. 715), 'The modern systematic divines either change—as do Zecharia, Reinhard, Storr—the *præsentia realis* of the body and blood of Christ, into a *præsentia operativa*, a presence of Christ, not in substance, but in operation; or they deny altogether—with Henke, Eckermann, de Wette, Wegscheider—the presence of the celestial body of Christ, in the sense maintained by the ancients.' *Tr.*]

was very warm debate in Switzerland for a long time. For the inhabitants of Zurich, Bern, and others, would by no means have taken from them the doctrine which they had learned from Zwingli respecting the sacred Supper.¹ Nor were they easily persuaded to admit the Calvinistic doctrine of *predestination* into the creed of the church.² Yet by the perseverance, the high reputation, and the prudence of *Calvin*, after very warm altercations, a reconciliation between him and the Swiss was effected, first in regard to the Lord's Supper in 1549 and 1554, and afterwards in regard to predestination.³ After this his pupils were so successful as gradually to bring nearly the whole Reformed church to embrace his new opinions; to which event his own writings contributed not a little.⁴

§ 14. Let us next survey the countries in which the Reformed religion, as shaped by *Calvin*, obtained a fixed and permanent residence. Among the German princes, *Frederic III.*, Elector Palatine, in the year 1560, substituted the followers of *Calvin's* doctrines in place of the Lutheran teachers whom he displaced, and ordered his subjects to receive the rites and the opinions of the Genevans.⁵ His successor, *Lewis*, in the year 1576, rescinded the acts of his father, and restored the Lutheran doctrine to its former dignity and authority. But this again fell, on the accession of *John Casimir* to the government of the Palatine countries, in 1583: for he, with his deceased father,⁶ *Frederic III.*, had gone over to the side of the Reformed, and it was necessary again to give Calvinism the pre-eminence.⁷ From that time onward the Palatine church held the second rank among the Reformed churches; and it possessed such influence over the others, that the religious instructions, composed for its use by *Zechariah Ursinus*, and denominated the *Heidelberg Catechism*, were received nearly throughout the whole body.⁸ In the republic of Bremen, *Albert Hardenberg*, a friend of *Melancthon*, in the year 1556, first attempted to propagate the Calvinistic doctrine respecting the Lord's Supper. And although his attempt for the present was unsuccessful, and he was expelled the city, yet it was found impossible

¹ See Fuesslin's *Cent. Epistolar.* p. 264. *Museum Helveticum*, i. 490, v. 479, 483, 490, ii. 79, &c.

² See *Museum Helveticum*, ii. 105, 107, 117. Dan. Gerdes, *Miscellanea Gröningens.* Nov. ii. 476, 477. I omit the common writers, as Ruchat, Hottinger, &c.

³ See the *Consensus Genev. et Tigurinor.* in Calvin's *Opuscula*, p. 754, &c.

⁴ Dan. Ern. Jablonsky, in his *Epistolæ ad Leibnitium*, published by Kapp, p. 24, 25, 49, contends that there is no longer any one, among the Reformed, who holds to Zwingli's opinion respecting the Lord's Supper. But it is certain there are many such: and at the present day, his opinion has in a sense revived in England, in Switzerland, and in other countries.

⁵ Henry Altling's *Historia Eccles. Palatina*; in Lud. Christ. Miege's *Monumenta*

Palatina, i. 223, &c. Löscher's *Hist. Motuum*, pt. ii. l. iv. c. iv. p. 125. Salig's *Hist. der Augsburg Confession*, vol. iii. b. ix. ch. v. p. 433, &c.

⁶ [In the original, it is not *father*, but *brother*; which is a manifest error of the press. For John Casimir was not the brother of Frederic III., but his son. *Schl.*]

⁷ Altling, *loc. cit.* p. 223, 245. Löscher, l. c. pt. iii. l. vi. p. 234. But especially Burch. Gotth. Struve's *Pfälzische Kirchenhistorie*; who has learnedly treated of these events, p. 110, &c.

⁸ On the Heidelberg, or Palatine Catechism and Confession, see Jo. Chr. Köcher's *Bibliotheca Theol. Symbolicæ*, p. 593 and 908 [and especially his *Catechetical History of the Reformed churches*; in which he treats particularly of the history of the Heidelberg Catechism; Jena, 1756, 8vo. *Schl.*]

to prevent the people of Bremen from uniting with the Reformed church towards the close of the century.¹ In what manner other portions of the German population were gradually brought to relish the doctrines of *Calvin*, must be learned from those who undertake to write a full history of Christianity.

§ 15. The first among the French who abandoned the Romish religion, are commonly called Lutherans by the writers of those times; and from this name and some other circumstances, the inference has been drawn, that they were all believers in *Luther's* doctrines, and averse from those of the Swiss.² To me they appear to have been a mixed company of various sorts of persons. The vicinity, however, of Geneva, Lausanne, and other cities which embraced the Calvinistic system of doctrines and discipline, and the astonishing zeal of *Calvin*, *Farel*, *Beza*, with others, in fostering, encouraging, and multiplying opponents to the Roman see in France, induced them all, before the middle of the century arrived, to profess themselves the friends and brethren of the Genevans. By their enemies they were contumeliously denominated *Huguenots*: the origin of which appellation is uncertain. They were, however, tossed by various tempests and misfortunes, and endured greater calamities and sufferings than any other portion of the protestant church; and this, notwithstanding they could number exalted princes and nobles of the nation among their party.³ Even the peace, which they obtained from *Henry III.* in 1576, proved the commencement of a most destructive civil war, in which the very powerful family of *Guise*, being set on by the Roman pontiffs, endeavoured to overthrow and extirpate the Reformed religion, together with the royal family; and on the other hand, the Huguenots, led on by generals of the highest rank, fought for their religion and their kings with various success. These horrible commotions, in which both parties committed many acts which posterity must ever reprobate, were at length terminated by the prudence and heroism of *Henry IV.* The king himself, perceiving that his throne would never be firm and stable if he persevered in spurning the authority of the pontiff, exchanged the purer religion for the old one: on the other hand, however, he published the edict of Nantes in 1598, in which he gave to the Reformed, who he saw could not be subdued, full liberty to worship God in their own way, and the greatest security that was possible.⁴

¹ Salig, *loc. cit.* pt. iii. b. x. ch. v. p. 715, and ch. vi. p. 776, &c. Löscher, *loc. cit.* pt. ii. lib. iv. ch. v. p. 134, and pt. iii. lib. vi. ch. vii. p. 276. Gerdes, *Hist. Renovati Evangelii*, iii. 157 [and especially his *Historia Motuum Ecclesiasticorum in Civitate Bremensi*, ab anno 1547 ad an. 1561, *tempore Alberti Hardenbergii suscitatorum, ex Authenticis Monumentis*: Gröningen, 1756, 4to, also reprinted in his *Scrinium Antiquar. seu Nov. Miscell.* Gröningens. t. v. pt. i. See also the *Brem- und Verdische-Bibliothek*, vol. iii. pt. iii. no. 5. *Schl.*]

² See Löscher's *Historia Motuum*, pt. ii. c. vi. p. 46. Salig's *Hist. der Augsburg Confession*, vol. ii. b. v. ch. v. and vi. p. 190, &c.

³ See *Histoire Ecclés. des Eglises Réformées au Royaume de France*, in three volumes, Antwerp, 1580, 8vo, which is commonly ascribed to Theodore Beza. The writers on the Gallic church and its Confession of faith are enumerated by Köcher, *Bibliotheca Theol. Symbolica*, p. 299, &c.

⁴ Elias Benoit, *Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes*, t. i. l. v. p. 200, &c. Gabr. Daniel's

§ 16. The Scottish church honours *John Knox*, a disciple of *Calvin*, as its founder; and from him, as a matter of course, it received from

Hist. de France, ix. 409, &c. of the last Paris edition. Boulay's *Hist. Acad. Paris*, t. vi. the whole volume. [For a sketch of the rise and progress of Protestantism in France, till the death of Francis I., in 1547, see sec. i. c. ii. § 33, note. During the reign of Henry II., the son and successor of Francis, from 1547 to 1549, the persecution of the reformed was still more systematic, determined, and unsparing. In 1551, the civil courts were required to co-operate with the spiritual, and to exterminate all heretics. The estates of all emigrants, on account of religion, were to be confiscated. No books whatever might be imported from any protestant country; and to print, or sell, or possess protestant books was made penal. Many were imprisoned, and put to death. In 1555, the civil courts were forbidden to hear appeals from the ecclesiastical; and all magistrates were to execute the decisions of the latter. The Parliament of Paris refused to register this decree, and made a noble remonstrance to the king. In 1557, the king appointed commissioners, to aid the bishops in exterminating all heretics: but the parliament refused to register this decree. In 1558, the cardinal of Lorraine, with the consent of the king, established a limited inquisition. But several of the courts still favoured and protected the protestants; and the king summoned a meeting called a *mercurial*; and learning that a number of his judges secretly favoured the reformers, he imprisoned several of them, and one was put to death. But amidst all their persecutions, the protestants multiplied greatly during this reign. Two princes of the blood, the king of Navarre, and the prince of Condé, and a great number of the nobility and gentry, were their friends and supporters. Hence they set up churches everywhere, had regular preachers, and stated, though generally secret, meetings for worship. In 1559, the king of Navarre and the prince of Condé encouraged and attended meetings of some thousands for worship, in a meadow near Paris, in open day; at the close of which the people publicly marched into the city. In the same year, the protestants held their first national synod privately at Paris; and there adopted a confession of faith, catechism, and directory for worship, composed by Calvin; and likewise formed a system of church government. Their doctrines were strictly Calvinistic; their worship very simple, and almost without written forms; and their system of government entirely presbyterian. Single churches were governed by *Consistoires* (Sessions), composed of the pastors and

ruling elders, many of whom were noblemen. From the Consistories, lay appeals to the *Colloquies* or *Classes* (Presbyteries), composed of pastors and elders, deputed from the Consistories, and meeting twice a year. From these Colloquies, there were appeals to the *Provincial Synods*, composed of all the Colloquies in a province, and meeting once a year. *National Synods* were composed of one pastor and one elder from each of the sixteen provincial Synods. This supreme ecclesiastical tribunal did not meet regularly, but as occasion required; and at each meeting, some province was named to call the next meeting. From 1559 to 1559, there were twenty-nine national synods holden; which heard appeals, answered cases of conscience, revised their rules and regulations, and transacted various concerns of the whole body. (See their acts published by John Quick, entitled *Synodicon in Gallia Reformata*, London, 1692, 2 vols. fol.)—Francis II., a youth of sixteen, and feeble both in body and mind, succeeded his father Henry II. in 1559. His mother, Catharine de Medicis, the duke of Guise, and his brother, the cardinal of Lorraine, all decided catholics, in fact ruled the nation, and endeavoured to crush the Reformation. The king of Navarre, the prince of Condé, the admiral Coligni, and others friendly to the protestants, conspired to overthrow the power of the Guises: but they were betrayed, and thus involved themselves and all the protestants in persecution. Many perished; numbers fled the country; and still more were imprisoned, robbed of their property, and variously harassed, during the seventeen months of this reign. In 1560, Charles IX., aged eleven years, succeeded his brother Francis, till 1574. His mother was regent. To secure her power, she now sought the friendship of the king of Navarre, and of the protestants; and even listened herself to the protestant preachers. She needed money: and the states-general were assembled in 1561: but they did nothing but wrangle. The catholics demanded the extirpation of all heretics: and the protestants demanded toleration. The court issued a decree forbidding religious disputes, releasing the imprisoned protestants, and allowing toleration to all who would externally conform to the established religion, unless they chose to quit the country. The provincial authorities favourable to the protestants carried the decree into effect: others would not. In July, 1561, there was a fruitless conference of catholic and protestant divines at Poissy, to effect a compromise between the two religions. Though

its commencement the doctrines, institutions, and government of the Genevans. And in maintaining these pure and uncontaminated, it

the country was in great disorder, the protestants were prosperous, and continually multiplying. To prevent murders and seditions, the court persuaded the people of both religions to give up their arms, and to trust to the protection of the government. In January 1562, a national convention met at St. Germain, and agreed, that the protestants should be allowed to hold private worship, till a general council should decide all religious disputes. The protestants were not quite satisfied with this; but the catholics were outrageous. Tumults ensued. The king of Navarre, to gain an addition to his territory, abandoned the protestants; and summoned the duke of Guise to the capital, to suppress the tumults. He obeyed; and passing through Vassi in Champagne, found a protestant assembly holding worship in a barn. His soldiers commenced a quarrel with them, and then murdered two hundred and sixty of their number. A civil war now broke out. The protestants made Orleans their head-quarters, and had the prince of Condé and admiral Coligni for leaders; while the catholics were commanded by the duke of Guise, the king of Navarre, and the constable Montmorency. Much blood was shed, and many towns were taken and ravaged. The king of Navarre fell in battle: the duke of Guise was assassinated; Montmorency and Condé were both taken prisoners. Peace was concluded at Amboise, March 1563, on the ground of a general amnesty for the past, and free toleration of protestant worship in particular places throughout France. The treaty was not well observed; and the protestants, finding the court determined on their ruin, renewed the war in 1567, under Coligni and the prince of Condé. Montmorency fell, and many other noblemen on both sides. Peace was concluded early in 1568, on nearly the same terms as before. But three months after, hostile movements on the part of the court, caused the war to be renewed with increased violence. The prince of Condé fell in battle, in 1559: but the queen of Navarre, with her son and the young prince of Condé, all zealous protestants, now appeared in the field. Peace was concluded in 1570, on the conditions of amnesty for the past, free toleration of the protestants everywhere, a limited right to except against catholic judges, and the possession of four cities (Rochelle, Cognac, Montauban, and la Charité), for two years, to be garrisoned by protestants. To lull the protestants into security, the court now enforced the terms of the treaty with much apparent zeal, proposed a marriage between the young king of Navarre and the king's sister,

and at length drew Coligni, the king of Navarre, and the prince of Condé, to appear at court. All this was preparatory to the assassination of the protestants, by order of the king and queen mother, on St. Bartholomew's eve, Aug. 23, 1572. The bloody scene began at midnight, at the signal of tolling the great bell of the palace, and continued three days at Paris. Coligni was the first victim. With him, five hundred noblemen, and about six thousand other protestants were butchered in Paris alone. Orders were despatched to all parts of the empire, for a similar massacre everywhere. More than thirty thousand—some say seventy thousand—perished by the hand of the royal assassins; and the pope ordered a jubilee throughout Christendom. The protestants were weakened, but not destroyed. Losing all confidence in the government, they entered into combinations for their safety. The prince of Condé escaped from his prison, and went to Germany to form alliances in their behalf. Charles IX. died in 1574, and was succeeded by his brother, Henry III., a dissolute man, and a violent catholic. Civil war raged again: but peace was concluded in 1576. The protestants were to enjoy freedom of worship everywhere, except at Paris, and within two miles of the king's residence. Courts, half catholics and half protestants, were to be established in the principal cities; and ten cautionary towns were to be given them. The catholics, dissatisfied as usual with concessions of liberty to the protestants, combined with the pope and the king of Spain, and obliged the king to abrogate his decrees for giving effect to the treaty. The war was renewed in 1577; and continued, with some interruptions, till 1580; when the protestants were allowed their former liberties, and their cautionary towns for six years. But in 1584, the catholic chiefs, particularly the Guises, formed a league with Philip, king of Spain, for exterminating the protestants, and transferring the crown of France to the family of Guise, on the demise of the present king. War was of course renewed with the protestants, at the head of whom were the king of Navarre, and prince of Condé. The Guises and their allies checked the protestants, but alienated the king, who caused the duke of Guise to be assassinated. Henry III. now found himself so odious to the catholic league, that he was obliged to make peace with the king of Navarre and the protestants; and they generously supported him till his death in 1589. The king of Navarre was the next legal heir to the crown of France, which he

ever has been, and still is, so zealous, that in the seventeenth century, it did not hesitate to avenge with the sword the temerity of those who were desirous of introducing something foreign into it.¹ In England the case was very different. This nation never could be persuaded to submit itself entirely to the decisions of Geneva; nor did it long retain unaltered, what it actually received from that quarter. It is pretty well attested that the greatest part of those Englishmen who first renounced the superstitions of their fathers, were more inclined to the opinions of *Luther*, respecting the holy Supper, the mode of public worship, and the government of the church, than to those of the Swiss. But after the death of *Henry VIII.*, the industry of *Calvin* and his disciples, especially *Peter Martyr*, caused the former opinions to be excluded, and the latter to gain admission into the universities, the schools, the pulpits, and the minds of the majority.² Hence, in the reign of *Edward VI.*, when they came to deliberate what system of doctrine and discipline should be established, the English embraced the communion of the Genevans; yet with this limitation, that it was thought advisable to retain the old organisation of the church (which was very different from that of Geneva), together with some rites and ceremonies, which most of the Reformed regard as very superstitious.³ Yet this diversity,

assumed, with the name of *Henry IV.*, and was supported by all the protestants, and by the catholics who adhered to the late king. But the leaguers refused to acknowledge him; and he had to contend several years for his crown. At length, in 1595, to put a stop to the civil wars, he professed the catholic religion. Yet he gave free toleration to his protestant subjects. In 1598, he published the edict of Nantes, as the basis of their liberties; and by it he confirmed to them all the privileges ever before conceded to them; gave them equal civil rights, equal privileges in the universities and public schools; allowed them courts, half protestant and half catholic, in the principal cities; made them eligible to all public offices; and allowed them to establish public worship, in places of a particular description throughout the realm. He also gave them an annual stipend of about forty thousand crowns, for the support of their ministers. And though the catholics murmured, and endeavoured to infringe upon their rights, *Henry* protected them to the end of his reign, in 1610.—The number of protestants in France, during the last half of this century, was supposed to be from a million to a million and a half. At one time (1571), they claimed to have two thousand one hundred and fifty churches, but many of them were only *family churches* or the households of the nobles. The number of regular churches, stated in the acts of their national synods, was generally from seven to eight hundred. Some of these were

vastly large, and had three, four, and even five pastors; while others were very small, and were joined two or three together under one pastor. They could reckon men of great learning and talents among them. They were in close fellowship with the church of Geneva, and with the Flemish protestants. Their adherence to their creeds and their discipline were strict. Take an example. In 1578, the Consistory of Rochelle debarred the prince of Condé the communion, because one of his ships had taken a prize after the signing of the last peace; which he continued to hold as a lawful prize, because the capture was made before the forty days assigned for the publication of the treaty had expired. He appealed to the National Synod; which decided against him. See Quick's *Synodicon*, i. 122. For the facts in this note, I am indebted chiefly to Gifford's *History of France*, vol. iii.; Quick's *Synodicon*, vol. i.; and Ingram Cobbin's *Historical View of the Reformed Church in France*, London, 1816. Tr.]

¹ Salig's *Historie der Augsbург Confession*, vol. ii. b. vi. ch. i. p. 403.

² See Löscher's *Hist. Motuum*, pt. ii. l. iii. c. vii. p. 67, and the authorities he quotes: Salig's *Hist. der Augsburg Confession*, vol. ii. b. vi. ch. iii. p. 317, &c. and others.

³ [It is evident from this sentence, that Dr. Mosheim's knowledge of English ecclesiastical history was very limited. It is not true that England 'embraced the com-

slight as it might then be deemed, and to be borne with, as *Calvin* himself attested, afterwards produced numerous perils, calamities, and wars, to the injury both of the church and the commonwealth of England.

§ 17. The commencement of this lamentable schism, which to this day no means have been able to heal, was with those who fled to save their lives and liberties, in the year 1554, when *Mary* reigned, or rather *raged*, in England. Some of these celebrated their public worship according to the liturgy established by *Edward VI.*; but others preferred the more simple, and, in their view, more pure worship of the Swiss. The former were denominated *Conformists*, because they conformed their worship to the pattern legally established by *Edward*: the latter were called *Nonconformists*, and also *Puritans*, because they desired greater purity in worship, and did not regard the liturgy of king *Edward* as free from all the dregs of superstition. These appellations have continued in use; and to this day they designate the Christian communities by which Great Britain is divided. When the exiles returned to their country, on the accession of *Elizabeth* to the throne, this controversy being introduced into England, soon became so great and threatening, that the more sagacious even then despaired of any reconciliation. The wise queen did not confine the reformation to the rigorous principles of the Genevans and their followers the Puritans, but she enjoined on those to whom she entrusted this business, to follow the patterns of the early ages, rather than that of the Genevans.¹ When she had modelled the whole church, and especially the public worship, on these principles, she published the celebrated *Act of Uniformity*, requiring all Englishmen to observe her regulations. The *Puritans* urged, that they could not in conscience yield obedience; and bitterly complained, that the defilements of the Roman religion, which had been removed, were brought back again. The more vehement argued, that recent enactments ought to be wholly repealed, and the church moulded after the Genevan fashion; while the more temperate merely desired liberty to worship God themselves, according to their own opinions. The queen, determining to show no indulgence to either, employed all the

munions of the Genevans,' under Edward; although Bp. Hooper, in that reign, brought some low-church notions from Switzerland, and on Elizabeth's accession, more such were brought from the same quarter. The theology of Calvin, too, was generally received among English divines, during most of Elizabeth's reign. But the country itself never stood formally committed to Geneva in any way. S.]

¹ [Dr. Mosheim seems disposed, by this ambiguous expression of the *primitive ages*, to insinuate that queen Elizabeth had formed a pure, rational, and evangelical plan of religious discipline and worship. It is, however, certain, that, instead of being willing to strip religion of the ceremonies which remained in it, she was rather inclined to bring the public worship still

nearer to the Romish ritual (Heylin, p. 124), and had a great propensity to several usages in the church of Rome, which were justly looked upon as superstitious. She thanked publicly one of her chaplains, who had preached in defence of the *real presence*; she was fond of images, and retained some in her private chapel (Heylin, p. 124), and would undoubtedly have forbidden the marriage of the clergy, if Cecil, her secretary, had not interposed. (Strype's *Life of Parker*, p. 107, 108, 109.) Having appointed a committee of divines to review king Edward's liturgy, she gave them an order to strike out all offensive passages against the pope, and to make people easy about the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament. (Neal's *Hist. of the Puritans*, i. 138.)' Macl.]

means which penal laws and her own sagacity could afford, in order to suppress the obstinate sect. In this manner the purification of the old religion, by which the English church is equally distinguished from the popish and from all the others that have renounced the dominion of the pontiff, was confirmed and established; and at the same time, a foundation was laid for continual discord, sadly to the injury of a fortunate nation.¹

§ 18. The first cause that gave rise to so many strange and calamitous events was very trivial, and of no consequence to religion and piety. The leaders of the *Puritans* held in abhorrence those garments, which the English clergy wore, for the sake of distinction, in their public assemblies. For these garments having been derived from the papists, were, in their view, the *badges of Antichrist*. From this they proceeded to other matters, of somewhat greater importance. First, they conceived that the constitution of the English church was a departure from the form established by Christ; and maintained, what they had learned from *Calvin* and the *Genevans*, that all the ministers of religion, by divine appointment, ought to be equal in rank and authority. They had indeed no objections to allowing an individual to bear the title of bishop, and to preside in the meetings of his brethren, for the sake of preserving order; but they would not allow him to claim the prerogatives of the old bishops, to rank among the peers of the realm, to be employed in civil affairs, and be distinguished by wealth and power. The weight of this controversy was not great, so long as the English bishops founded their rank and authority upon the laws of the land and human constitution; but it assumed a far graver character, after the year 1588, when *Richard Bancroft*, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, first ventured publicly to affirm that bishops are an order superior to that of presbyters, not by mere human appointment, but by the will of God.² This sentiment meeting the approbation of great numbers, the consequence was, what might be anticipated, that none were deemed properly admitted into the sacred office, unless they were ordained by a bishop; and that the ministers of those churches which have no bishops, were

¹ No one has treated this subject more fully, or more agreeably than Daniel Neal; whose *History of the Puritans or Protestant Nonconformists* was published not long since, at London, in four volumes. The first volume was printed, London, 1732, 8vo, the last volume appeared in 1738. Yet the author, who was himself a puritan, could not so command his party feelings and his passions, as entirely to avoid sectarian zeal. For while he is full in narrating and emblazoning the wrongs which the bishops inflicted or caused to be inflicted upon the puritans, he frequently extenuates, excuses, or passes silently over the faults of the puritan sect. The reader may also consult Jo. Strype's *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury under Queen Elizabeth*, namely,

Parker, Grindal, and Whitgift; which are written with great copiousness and labour. [See also Bogue and Bennet's *History of Dissenters*, vol. i. London, 1809, and Benj. Brook's *Lives of the Puritans*, vol. i. Lond. 1813. Tr.]—This account of Neal's work must be taken as the partial witness of one who holds the same, or similar opinions. The truth is, that Neal is highly unsatisfactory to members of the Church of England, and that his first volume was promptly, though incompletely, answered by Bp. Madox. S.]

² See Jo. Strype's *Life and Acts of John Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury*, p. 121, Lond. 1718, fol. [Neal's *History of the Puritans*, vol. i. ch. vii. p. 180, &c. Tr.]

thought to be without the qualifications necessary for their function, and to be inferior to the popish priests.

§ 19. In the next place, the Puritans conceived that those churches, which from having the sees¹ of bishops are called *cathedrals*, ought to be done away, together with all who live upon their revenues, the archdeacons, the deans, the prebendaries, and the canons: they also disapproved of the mode of worship usually practised in cathedrals: and, in particular, denied that instrumental music and chanting were proper in the worship of God. They likewise thought, that not only the vicious, but also persons of dubious piety, should be excluded from the church. For it being their opinion that the church is the company of the faithful, they of course held that care should be taken lest any who are destitute of faith should creep into it. They required many alterations in the rites and ceremonies which were enjoined by the authority of the queen and the supreme council.² For instance, they considered all holy days dedicated to the memory of sainted individuals, as unlawful: they would not allow the sign of the cross, in various transactions, but especially in the sacrament

¹ [*Cathedra*, a seat or chair. *S.*]

² [Dr. Maclaine supposes the *supreme council* here mentioned to be the noted *high commission court*. But that court was an *executive* and *visitatorial* body, not *legislative*. It seems, therefore, that Mosheim intended by the *supreme council*, either the British *parliament*, or perhaps the queen's privy council, which possessed much the same powers as a German prince with his Consistorial council. The queen with her privy council repeatedly published *Injunctions*, or regulations for the church, which she enforced by the episcopal and high commission courts; and these arbitrary decrees of the queen were substituted for acts of parliament, which she more than once forbade to legislate on such subjects; so that she assumed to be the real lawgiver of the English church. See Neal's *Hist. of the Puritans*, vol. i. ch. iv. p. 167, &c. Yet the account which Dr. Maclaine here gives of the *high commission court*, is worth repeating. 'This court' (says he) 'took its rise from a remarkable clause in the *act of supremacy*, by which the queen and her successors were empowered to choose persons to exercise, under her, all manner of jurisdiction, privileges, and pre-eminences, touching any spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction within the realms of England and Ireland, as also to visit, reform, redress, order, correct, and amend all errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, contempts, offences, enormities whatsoever; provided, that they have no power to determine any thing to be heresy, but what has been adjudged to be so by the authority of the canonical scripture, or by the first four general councils, or any of them; or by any other general councils, wherein the

same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of canonical scripture, or such as shall hereafter be declared to be heresy by the High Court of Parliament, with the assent of the clergy in Convocation. Upon the authority of this clause, the queen appointed a certain number of *commissioners* for ecclesiastical causes, who, in many instances, abused their power. The court they composed was called the *Court of High Commission*, because it claimed a more extensive jurisdiction and higher powers, than the ordinary *Courts of the Bishops*. Its jurisdiction reached over the whole kingdom, and was much the same with that which had been lodged in the single person of lord Cromwell, vicar general to Henry VIII. These *commissioners* were empowered to make inquiry, not only by the legal methods of juries and witnesses, but by all other ways and means which they could devise, that is, by rack, torture, inquisition, and imprisonment. They were vested with a right to examine such persons as they suspected, by administering to them an oath (not allowed of in their commission, and therefore called *ex officio*), by which they were obliged to answer all questions, and thereby might be obliged to accuse themselves, or their most intimate friends. The fines they imposed were merely discretionary; the imprisonment to which they condemned was limited by no rule but their own pleasure; they imposed, when they thought proper, new articles of faith on the clergy; and practised all the iniquities and cruelties of a real *Inquisition*. See Rapin's and Hume's *Histories of England*, under the reign of Elizabeth; and Neal's *History of the Puritans*, *passim*. Tr.]

of baptism: they were displeased with the employment of sponsors or god-fathers and god-mothers, at the baptism of infants whose parents were still living;¹ nor would they suffer new-born infants to be baptized by any persons but the priests: they would not have the sacred books of secondary rank, or those commonly denominated the *Apocrypha*, to be read and expounded to the people; the stated forms of prayer, they would not indeed wholly exclude from public worship, but they demanded that the teachers should be allowed to vary from them, and to alter them, as they saw fit, and be permitted to pray to God in their own language, and not merely in the words of others: in short, they conceived that the worship of their country ought to be conformable to the principles and institutions of the Genevans, and that nothing should be tolerated that was akin to the Roman system.

§ 20. These opinions could not well be defended, or impugned, without calling in the aid of certain general principles, which would support the positions adopted; and from which the importance of the controversy may be estimated. Those who took sides with the queen and the supreme council, maintained, I. That the right to *reform* or to abolish and correct errors and defects, both in doctrine and in discipline and worship, belonged to the civil magistrate. The *Puritans*, on the contrary, denied that God had assigned this office to the magistrate; and held with *Calvin*, that it was rather the business of the ministers of Christ to restore religion to its purity and dignity. II. The former considered that the rule of proceeding in reforming the doctrine and discipline of the church, was not to be derived exclusively from the holy Scriptures, but also from the writings and the practice of the early ages of the church. The *Puritans*, on the other hand, maintained, that the divinely inspired books were the only pure source from which could be derived rules for purging and regulating the church; and that the enactments and the doctors of the early ages had no authority whatever. III. The former declared the church of Rome to be a true church, though much deformed and corrupted; they said, the Roman pontiff, indeed, presumptuously claims to be the head and monarch of the whole church, yet he must be acknowledged to be a legitimate bishop; and of course, the ministers ordained by his authority have the most perfect right to minister in holy things. It was necessary for the English bishops to inculcate such principles, if they would trace back the origin and prerogatives of their office to the apostles of Christ. But very different were the views of the *Puritans*. They constantly maintained that the Roman church had forfeited the title and the rights of a true church; that its bishop was the very *Antichrist*; that all its discipline and worship were vain, superstitious, and opposed to the precepts of the gospel; and of course, that all communion with that church was to be shunned more

¹ [‘Other rites and customs displeasing to the puritans, and omitted by our author, were, *kneeling at the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, bowing at the name of Jesus, giving the ring in marriage, the prohibition of*

marriage during certain times of the year, and the licencing it for money, as also the *confirmation of children* by *episcopal* imposition of hands.’ *Macl.*]

carefully than the plague itself. IV. The former deemed the best form of the church to be that which prevailed in the four or five first centuries; indeed, that it was preferable to that established by the apostles themselves; because *they* gave such a shape to the church, as suited its infantile and nascent state, and left to those who should come after them to regulate it more perfectly, when it should become fully established and extended. On the contrary, the *Puritans* contended, that all the principles of church government were laid down in the Scriptures; and that the ambassadors of Christ set forth an unchangeable pattern, which was to be imitated by all succeeding ages, when they directed the first Christian churches to be regulated and governed in the manner then practised in the Jewish congregations.¹ V. The former contended, that things indifferent, which are neither commanded nor forbidden by the holy Scriptures, such as rites of public worship, attire of priests, festivals, may be settled by the supreme magistrate, according to his pleasure; and that to disobey his laws on these subjects is as sinful as to violate his laws relative to civil affairs. But the *Puritans* contended, that it was improper and wrong to impose as necessary, things that *Christ* Himself had left free: for thus the liberty, which *Christ* has procured for us, is subverted. They added, that such rites as tend to infect the mind with superstition, can by no means be regarded as indifferent, but must be avoided as impious and profane. And such, in their estimation, were those ancient ceremonies which the queen and the parliament refused to abrogate.²

§ 21. This contest of the court and bishops with those who called aloud for a further reformation of the church, would have been far more severe and perilous, if such as bore the common name of *Puritans* had been agreed in their opinions and feelings. But this body was composed of persons of various dispositions and characters, whose only bond of union was their dislike of the religion and discipline established by law; and, therefore, it very soon became divided into sects; some of which were both misled themselves, and misled others, by fanatical imaginations, and others displayed their folly by devising strange and unusual forms for the constitution of churches. Of these sects, none is more famous than that which was formed, about the year 1581, by *Robert Browne*, an unstable and fickle-minded man. He did not differ materially from either the Episcopalians or the other *Puritans* as to the doctrines of religion; but he had new and

¹ [Or Synagogues. *Tr.*]

² ['Dr. Mosheim, in these five articles, has followed the account of this controversy given by Mr. Neal, in his *History of the Puritans*. This latter adds a *sixth* article, not of debate, but of union. Both parties (says he) agreed *too well* in asserting the necessity of an uniformity in public worship, and of calling in the sword of the magistrate for the support and the defence of their several principles, which they made an ill use of in their turns, as they could

grasp the power into their hands. The standard of uniformity, according to the bishops, was the *queen's supremacy*, and the *laws of the land*; according to the puritans, the *decrees of provincial and national synods*, allowed and enforced by the civil magistrate. But neither party were for admitting that liberty of conscience, and freedom of profession, which is every man's right as far as is consistent with the peace of the government under which he lives.' *Macl.*]

singular views of the nature of the church and the regulation and government of it. He first distributed the whole body of Christians into small associations, such as those collected by the apostles: for so many persons as could conveniently be assembled in one place, and that of moderate dimensions, he affirmed constituted a church, and enjoyed all the privileges of a church. And each of these small congregations he pronounced to be independent and free, by divine constitution, from all jurisdiction both of bishops, who, according to the court, and of synods, which, according to the Puritans, have the right of governing the church. The supreme power to provide for the welfare and the peace of these little associations, according to his views, resided in the people; and all the members had equal powers and prerogatives. The congregated multitude, therefore, deliberated on sacred subjects; and whatever was voted by the majority, was considered as legitimately decided. The brotherhood selected certain persons, from among themselves, to teach publicly and to administer ordinances: and, if the interests of the church seemed to require it, they remanded these teachers of their own creation again to a private station. For these teachers were in no respects more sacred or elevated than the rest of the brethren, except by their power to perform sacred functions, for which they were wholly indebted to the election and consent of the brethren. Moreover, the office of teaching was by no means confined to them: but all the brethren, if they pleased, might prophesy in public, or exhort and instruct the fraternity. Hence, when the appointed preacher of the church had closed his discourse, the brethren severally were at liberty to hold forth, and let others know what they might have been revolving in their minds, or had not clearly apprehended in the discourse of the preacher. In short, *Browne* thought that the Christian world should now present the same aspect, as that of the churches in the days of the apostles. In maintaining such opinions, he and his associates were so assuming, as to hold that all bonds of harmony, communion, and charity, with churches differently constituted, were to be severed; and to declare that the English church, in particular, was above all others to be shunned, as being a spurious church, contaminated with the pollutions of popery, and destitute of all divine influences. This sect, impatient under the injuries it received (perhaps through its own fault) in England, removed to Holland, and settled at Middleburgh, Amsterdam, and Leyden: but it did not long continue. *Browne* himself returned to England, and, forsaking his new opinions, obtained a living in the established church.¹ The other exiles became embroiled by many internal dissensions.² These effects induced the wiser among them to modify the discipline of their founder, and make it more tolerable. In this manner from them originated the noted

¹ [The rectory of Achurch, in Northamptonshire. *Browne* really does not seem to have altered his opinions; for he never preached at Achurch. *S.*]

² *Dan. Neal's History of the Puritans,*

vol. i. ch. vi. p. 324. *Jo. Hornbeck's Summa Controversiarum*, l. x. p. 738, &c. *Fuller's Ecclesiastical History of Britain*, b. x. p. 168. [*Benj. Brook's Lives of the Puritans*, ii. 366, &c. *Tr.*]

sect of the *Independents* or *Congregational Brethren*, which still exists. But their history belongs to the next century.

§ 22. In the provinces of the Netherlands, it was long doubtful, whether those who renounced the Roman communion would join the fellowship of the Lutherans or of the Swiss: for each of these had many and strong partisans.¹ But in the year 1571, the preference was publicly given to the Swiss. For the *Belgic Confession* of Faith,² which was published in this year, was, for the most part, in unison with that adopted by the French Reformed church; and differed from the Augsburg Confession in several respects, and especially on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.³ The causes of this will readily appear, if we consider the proximity of the French, and the number of them residing in the Netherlands, the high reputation of *Calvin* and the Genevan school, and the indefatigable industry of the Genevans in extending the boundaries of their church. From this period, the Belgians publicly assumed the title of the *Reformed*, instead of that of *Lutherans*, which they had before borne: and in this they followed the example of the French, who had invented and first assumed this appellation. Yet the Belgians, while subject to the Spaniards, had disused the term *Reformed*, to avoid incurring odium, and had styled themselves *Associates of the Augsburg Confession*; because the Spanish court looked upon Lutherans as far better citizens than the disciples of *Calvin*, who, from their commotions in France, were deemed more inclined to sedition.⁴

§ 23. The knowledge of a more sound religion was carried into Poland, by the disciples of *Luther*, from Saxony.⁵ Afterwards, not

¹ Löscher's *Historia Motuum*, pt. iii. lib. v. cap. iv. p. 74.

² For an account of the Belgic Confession, see Köcher's *Bibliotheca Theol. Symbolicæ*, p. 216. [It was first composed in the Walloon language, by Guy de Bres, and first printed in French, in 1562. Afterwards it was translated into various languages; and was ratified (together with the Heidelberg Catechism, with which it harmonises), by the Synod of Dort, in 1619; and again at the Hague, in 1651. *Tr.*]

³ Gerhard Brandt's *Historie der Reformatie in en omtrent de Nederlanden*, vol. i. b. v. p. 253, &c.

⁴ The words of Brandt, l. cit. p. 254, 255, are these: 'Nochtans behielpen sick de Nederlandsche Gereformeerden met den titel van Augsburgsche Confessie, om dat die te hove niet so onaengenaem was als de Calvinische of Fransche, die de partije doorgaens hield te wesen een oproeriger Secte dan de Luthersche.'

⁵ [Polish Prussia was first enlightened by Luther's attack upon Romanism. It was a province that voluntarily submitted to Casimir III. for the purpose of shaking off the tyranny of the Teutonic knights. A long war with them ended in its formal incorpo-

ration with Poland, in 1466. But its former privileges were then secured, and as its town population was chiefly of German origin, that language was usually spoken, and an intimate connexion with the country retained. Wittemberg was a favourite place of education for its youth, and thence Luther's opinions found an immediate entrance into the province. So early as 1518, Knade, a native of Dantzic, threw off the monastic habit, married, and preached publicly in that city against Romanism. He was tried and imprisoned, but after a time released and compelled to leave Dantzic. He found shelter, however, with a nobleman near Thorn, and continued, under his protection, to preach protestantism. In 1520, Benchenstein preached the same doctrines in Dantzic, and two years after, Bonhald did the same. Others followed, and a considerable ferment being the consequence, Sigismund I. ordered the town council to maintain the existing religion, and put down innovation. This order being rather evaded than obeyed, Dantzic became daily more alienated from Romanism; but popular pretensions gaining a simultaneous accession of strength, the magistrates became alarmed, and imprisoned some of the more conspicuous

only the Bohemian brethren, whom the Romish priests had expelled from their country, but likewise some of the Swiss, disseminated their opinions among the Poles: not to mention the Anabaptists, the Anti-trinitarians, and others, who travelled in that country, and there collected congregations.¹ Hence there existed here and there throughout Poland three sorts of religious associations, those of the Bohemian brethren, the Lutherans, and the Swiss. In order to oppose with greater vigour their common enemies, they held a convention at Sendomir in the year 1570, and entered into a kind of confederation, on certain terms, comprehended in a confession usually called the *Agreement of Sendomir*.² But as this compromise was deemed too condescending, and injurious to the truth (for in it the opinions, which separate the Lutherans from the Reformed, were expressed in vague and ambiguous language), it was, not long after, opposed by many of the Lutherans; and in the next century was entirely abrogated; nor have those who desired and laboured to restore it, to this day, met with the success for which they hoped. In both the Prussias,³ after the death of *Luther* and *Melancthon*, very large congregations of the Reformed religion were gathered by certain persons, which flourish still.⁴

§ 24. The *Bohemian brethren*, as they are called, or *Moravians*,

reformers. This occasioned a riot in 1525, which placed the city in the hands of the reforming party, by which Romanism was formally abolished. The king now interfered with an overwhelming force, and in July 1526, Dantzic was again reduced completely under the dominion of Rome. Other towns of Poland had, however, caught the infection, and in 1534, a Dominican friar, named Klein, again preached against Romanism in Dantzic. This new reformer threw off the monastic habit in 1537, and being nominated preacher in St. Mary's church, by the civic authorities, he cleared it of the images, and regularly established Lutheranism: the town-council conniving, and the king merely prohibiting violent attacks upon the established religion. At length, however, Sigismund was compelled to interfere, and he sent an episcopal commission to Dantzic, which imprisoned Klein, but was quickly compelled to release him, and which failed of doing anything effectual. Klein died in 1546, having spent all his latter years unmolested. Simultaneously with these events, other towns of Prussia revolted from Rome, and thus when the Bohemian brethren arrived in 1548, the soil was extensively prepared for the growth of their doctrines. *Krasinski's Reformation in Poland*, i. 111, &c. S.]

¹ Löschner's *Hist. Motuum*, pt. iii. l. v. c. iii. p. 36. Salig's *Hist. der Augsburg. Confession*, vol. ii. b. vi. ch. iii. iv. v. p. 516. Adr. Regenvolscius, *Hist. Ecclesiar. Sla-*

vonicar, l. i. c. xvi. &c. p. 71, &c. Solignac's *Hist. de Pologne*, v. 40, &c. Nath. Fred. Kautz, *Præcipua Relig. Evangelicæ in Polonia Fata*, Hamb. 1738, 4to. [The most eminent among the reformed clergy of Poland was the famous John a Lasco, who preached some time in London, and, returning to Poland, did much to advance the reformation there. See his history and many of his letters, in Dan. Gerdes, *Miscell. Groningens.* t. i.—v. The protestants of Great Poland were chiefly Bohemian brethren: those of Little Poland embraced the views of the Swiss. Both these became united in 1555: but their union with the Lutherans was not so easily effected, *Tr.*]

² See Dan. Ern. Jablonsky's *Historia Consensus Sendomiriensis*, Berlin, 1731, 4to, and his *Epistola Apologetica*, printed in the same year, and directed against the exceptions of a certain Polish antagonist. [The synod of Sendomir was not exclusively ecclesiastical, several protestant nobles taking part in its deliberations. Anti-trinitarian doctrines had already gained extensive ground among Polish opponents of Romanism, but none with such opinions were admitted at Sendomir. The *Agreement or Consent* (*Consensus Sendimorensis*) was signed April 14, 1570. It may be seen in Count Krasinski's *Reformation in Poland*, i. 383. S.]

³ [The Brandenburg and Polish. *Tr.*]

⁴ Löschner's *Hist. Motuum*, pt. iii. l. vi. c. i. p. 216.

who were descended from the better sort of Hussites, and adopted peculiar regulations, designed especially to guard against the reigning vices; upon hearing of *Luther's* efforts to reform the church, sent envoys to him, as early as 1522, soliciting his friendship; and afterwards, from time to time, they proffered the hand of friendship to the Saxons, and to other members of our community. Nor did *Luther* and his friends find anything very censurable, either in their doctrines or their discipline; nay, the confession, which they subjected to his judgment, he did not indeed approve in all respects, yet he thought it might be tolerated.¹ After the death of *Luther*, most of the brethren being expelled their country in the year 1547, many of them, and especially among those that settled in Poland, inclined towards the side of the Reformed. There seemed indeed to be a renewal of the harmony between the Bohemians and the Lutherans, at the time of the *Agreement of Sendomir*, already mentioned; but the influence of this agreement soon after was greatly weakened, and gradually all the Bohemians united themselves with the Swiss.² The union at first contained the stipulation, that each community should enjoy its own regulations, and should keep up separate meetings for worship: but in the following century, at the councils of Ostrog, A.D. 1620, and 1627, all difference was done away; and the two communities of Bohemians and Swiss became consolidated into one, which took the name of the *Church of the United Brethren*, and retained the form and regulations of the Bohemians, but embraced the doctrines of the Reformed.³

§ 25. The descendants of the Waldenses, who lived shut up in the valleys of Piedmont, were led, by their proximity to the French and Genevans, to embrace their doctrines and worship. Yet they retained not a few of their ancient rules of discipline, so late as the year 1630. But in this year the greatest part of the Waldenses were swept off by

¹ See Jo. Gottl. Carpzov's *Nachricht von den Bömischen Brüdern*, p. 46, &c. Jo. Christ. Köcher's *Bibliotheca Theologiæ Symbolicæ*, p. 76, &c. [In 1552, the brethren sent two delegates to Luther, namely, John Horn and Mich. Weis, to congratulate him on his attaining to a knowledge of the truth. They also sent him, soon afterwards, a book entitled *Instruction for Children*, which they had composed for the benefit of their church. But as they here expressed clearly their opinion of the Lord's Supper (namely, that Christ himself was not actually present in it), and he freely censured this opinion, their intercourse with Luther was for a time interrupted. They were also displeased that he was more solicitous about purity of doctrine, than the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline. But as they perceived that it would be for their advantage to be reckoned among the adherents to the Augsburg Confession, they at times sought his communion, and exhibited to him their Confession, which he afterwards caused to be published. See

Jo. Amos Comenius, *Historia Fratrum Bohemorum*, Halle, 1702, 4to, p. 22, &c., and Jo. Ch. Köcher, *Von den Glaubensbekenntnissen der Bömischen Brüder*, Francfort, 1741, 8vo. *Schl.*]

² Besides those who treat professedly of the Bohemian brethren, as Comenius, *Camcrarius*, and *Lasitius*, the reader may consult Löscher's *Historia Motuum*, pt. iii. lib. v. c. vi. p. 99, &c. Salig's *Historie der Augustan. Confession*, vol. ii. b. vi. ch. iii. p. 520, &c. Adr. Regenvolscius, *Hist. Ecclesiar. Slavonicarum*, lib. i. c. xiii. xiv. xv. &c.

³ Regenvolscius, l. c. lib. i. c. xiv. p. 120. [On the doctrinal views of the Bohemian brethren, which coincided generally with those of Calvin, Jo. Theoph. Elsner (one of that sect) wrote an elaborate treatise, entitled: *Brevis Conspectus Doctrinæ Fratrum Bohemorum*; in which he shows what was their belief in the 15th, 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries; and which is printed in Dan. Gerdes' *Scrinium Antiquar. sive Miscellanea Gröningana*, vi. 381—457. *Tr.*]

pestilence, and their new teachers, whom they obtained from France, regulated all their affairs according to the pattern of the French Reformed church.¹ The Hungarians and Transylvanians were stirred up to burst the bonds of superstition, by the writings and the disciples of *Luther*. Afterwards *Matthew Devay* and others, in a more private way, and then about the year 1550, *Stephen Szegejin* and others, more openly, spread among them successfully the sentiments of the Swiss, respecting the Lord's Supper and the government of the church. This produced here, as in other countries, first, contests among the friends of a purer religion, and, at length, an open schism, which time has strengthened rather than diminished.²

§ 26. After the promulgation of the *Formula of Concord*, many of the German churches, which before belonged to the Lutheran communion, united themselves to the Reformed. Among these were the churches of Nassau, Hanau, Isenburg, and others. In the year 1595, the princes of Anhalt, chiefly at the instigation of *Wolfgang Amling*, embraced the Reformed worship in place of the Lutheran; which produced a long contest between the inhabitants of that principality and the Lutherans.³ Upon Denmark also, near the close of the century, the Reformed doctrines made an inroad, especially in regard to the Lord's Supper: for that kingdom abounded in disciples and admirers of *Melancthon*, who were disposed to promote peace among the protestants; at the head of whom was *Nicholas Hemming*, a pious and learned divine of Copenhagen. But the designs of *Hemming* and his friends becoming known prematurely, the other divines, who were unwilling to have Lutheranism set aside, opposed

¹ Jo. Leger's *Histoire Générale des Eglises Vaudoises*, l. i. c. xxxiii. p. 205, 206. Abrah. Scultet's *Annales Renovati Evangelii*, p. 294. Dan. Gerdes, *Hist. Evangelii Renovati*, ii. 401. [In 1530, the Waldenses having heard of the reformation in Switzerland and Germany, sent two of their barbs or ministers, Geo. Morel and Peter Masson, or Latome, to Berne, Basle, and Strasburg, to confer with the reformers there. Their written communication to Ecclampadius at Basle, describes their faith and practice, with great simplicity and candour; and the written answer of Ecclampadius was such as might be expected, kind, affectionate, and fraternal. See them in Gerdes, *Hist. Renovati Evangelii*, ii. 401—417. In their council in Angrogne, A.D. 1532, they adopted a short confession of faith, professedly embracing the doctrines they had firmly believed for four hundred years; yet manifestly a departure, in some particulars, from the principles stated by their deputies to Ecclampadius; and conformed to the new views he had communicated to them, especially in regard to free will, grace, predestination, and several points of practical religion. See this confession, in J. P. Perrin's *History of the Waldenses* (Eng. translation), t. i. b. ii.

ch. iv. p. 59, &c. In the same council, they took measures to procure an impression of the whole Bible in their native language: and also a supply of other religious books. See Perrin, loc. c. p. 61. *Tr.*]

² Paul Debrezen's *Historia Ecclesiæ Reformate in Hungaria et Transylvania*, l. ii. p. 64, 72, 98, &c. Compare the *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, A.D. 1738, p. 1076, &c. Geo. Hanner's *Historia Ecclesiæ Transylvanicarum*, Franc., 1694, 12mo.

³ Jo. Christ. Bechman's *Historie des Hauses Anhalt*, vol. ii. pt. vi. p. 133, &c. Jo. Melch. Kraft's *Ausführliche Historie von dem Exorcismo*, p. 428, 497, &c. [Though the princes professed Calvinism, and introduced Calvinist ministers in all the churches, where they had the right of patronage, yet the people were left free in their choice; and the noblemen and their vassals that were attached to Lutheranism had secured to them the unrestrained exercise of their religion. By virtue of a convention made in 1679, the Lutherans were permitted to erect new churches. The Zerbst line, with the greatest part of its subjects, profess Lutheranism; but the three other lines with their respective territories, are Calvinists.] *Macl.*]

so many obstructions, by means of the king, that those designs miscarried.¹

§ 27. Moreover, the nations that held communion with the Swiss did not embrace all the Helvetic tenets and institutions. *They* indeed ardently desired to have it so; but untoward circumstances frustrated their wishes. The English, as is well known, perseveringly rejected the ecclesiastical constitution and the form of worship adopted by the other Reformed churches; nor could they be persuaded to receive the common opinions of the Swiss respecting the Lord's Supper and the divine decrees, as the public sentiments of the whole nation.² The churches of the Palatinate, Bremen, Poland, Hungary, and Holland, agreed indeed with the Swiss or French respecting the Lord's Supper, the simplicity of their worship, and the form of church government; but not likewise in respect to *predestination*; which difficult subject they left to the discretion of individuals.³ And down to the time of the Synod of Dort, no portion of the Reformed community had required, by any law or public rule, a belief in the opinion of the Genevans respecting the causes of everlasting salvation and damnation. Yet the greatest part of the teachers in most of those

¹ Eric Pontoppidan's *Annales Ecclesiæ Danicæ Diplomaticæ*, iii. 57, &c.

² [‘It is true, indeed, that the doctrine of Zwingle, who represented the bread and wine as nothing more than the external signs of the death of Christ, was not adopted by the church of England: but the doctrine of Calvin was embraced by that church, and is plainly taught in the thirty-eighth article of its faith. As to what relates to the doctrine of the divine decrees, Dr. Mosheim is equally mistaken. The seventeenth article of the church of England is, as bishop Burnet candidly acknowledges, framed according to St. Augustin’s doctrine, which scarcely differs at all from that of Calvin; and, though it be expressed with a certain latitude that renders it susceptible of a mitigated interpretation, yet it is very probable, that those who penned it were patrons of the doctrine of absolute decrees. The very cautions, that are subjoined to this article, intimate that Calvinism was what it was meant to establish. It is certain, that the Calvinistical doctrine of predestination prevailed among the first English reformers, the greatest part of whom were at least Sublapsarians; in the reign of queen Elizabeth, this doctrine was predominant, but after that period it lost ground imperceptibly, and was renounced by the church of England in the reign of king Charles I. Some members of that church still adhered, nevertheless, to the tenets of Calvin, and maintained, not only that the thirty-nine articles were Calvinistical, but also affirmed, that they were not susceptible of being interpreted in that latitude for which the Ar-

minians contended. These episcopal votaries of Calvinism were called *doctrinal puritans*. See Burnet’s *Exposition of the Seventeenth Article*, &c., and Neal’s *History of the Puritans*, i. 579.’ *Macl.* See also A. M. Toplady’s *History of Calvinism*, 2 vols. 8vo. Bp. Tomline’s *Refutation of Calvinism*, 8vo. T. Scott’s *Remarks on Tomline on Calvinism*, 8vo, and the *Fathers, the Reformers, and the public Formularies of the Church of England, in harmony with Calvin*, &c. Philadelphia, 1817, 12mo. p. 108—119. *Tr.*—In estimating this account, it is needful to remember the writer’s partialities. Neal has no authority with members of the church of England, Toplady none with the great majority of them. The truth is, that the *Seventeenth Article* does not maintain Calvinistic doctrines with sufficient fulness and clearness to satisfy their friends. Hence the attempt to supply this deficiency by means of the *Lambeth Articles*, under Elizabeth. These would have been unnecessary, had the *Seventeenth Article* been of a complexion decidedly Calvinistic. It says, however, nothing of reprobation, or of irrelative predestination, and was evidently framed with an eye to the discouragement of speculations upon such subjects. Its principal, if not sole framer, was Abp. Cranmer, and there is no evidence, perhaps no probability, of his belief in ‘the doctrine of absolute decrees.’ *S.*]

³ See Hugo Grotius, *Apologeticus eorum qui Hollandiæ ante Mutationem*, A.D. 1618, *prefuerunt*, cap. iii. p. 54, &c. ed. Paris, 1640, 12mo.

countries came spontaneously by degrees into the Genevan views; in consequence, especially, of the reputation and influence of the school of Geneva, to which most of the candidates for the ministry of that age were accustomed to resort for instruction.

§ 28. The inspired books of the Old and New Testaments are held by the Reformed to be the only source of divine truth; except that the English forbid contempt to be shown to the authority of the church in the first five centuries.¹ And they maintain, equally with

¹ [‘There is nothing in the thirty-nine articles of the church of England which implies its considering the writings of the fathers of the first five centuries, as an authoritative criterion of religious truth. There is, indeed, a clause in the *Act of Uniformity*, passed in the reign of queen Elizabeth, declaring that her delegates, in ecclesiastical matters, should not determine anything to be heresy, but what was adjudged so by the authority of Scripture or by the first four general councils; and this has, perhaps, misled Dr. Mosheim, in the passage to which this note refers. Much respect, indeed, and perhaps too much, has been paid to the fathers; but that has been always a matter of choice, and not of obligation.’ *Macl.*—It was in regard to the constitution and government of the church, rather than in articles of faith, that the church of England paid more deference to the fathers, than the rest of the reformed did: and on this subject, they have actually copied after the practice of the first five centuries, as being obligatory upon the conscience. See § 20, above: and Neal’s *History of the Puritans*, vol. i. ch. iv. p. 183, 184, ed. Portsm. 1816. *Tr.*—The clause referred to by Maclaine, is not in the *Act of Uniformity*, but in the *Act of Supremacy*. Nor is the importance given by it to the first four general councils at all out of harmony with the principles laid down all along by the English reformers. On the contrary, they appealed constantly from the outset, to the first four general councils, and other documents of primitive theology. By such guides the clergy, under Elizabeth, were directed to study Scripture, and to expound it to their congregations. ‘The same convocation, which first enforced subscription on the clergy, passed also the following canon for the regulation of preaching throughout the kingdom, *That the clergy shall be careful never to teach anything from the pulpit, to be religiously held and believed by the people, but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old or New Testament, and collected out of that very same doctrine by the Catholic Fathers, and ancient bishops*. This canon, passed 1571, under the auspices of Archbishop Parker, has been often quoted (among others, repeatedly by Bishop Taylor)

as expressing the genuine, permanent sense of the Anglican church on the matters in question’ (those relating to tradition). (Keble’s *Sermon on Primitive Tradition*, Lond. 1837, p. 80.) It cannot be said in strict accuracy, that this canon was passed by the convocation of 1571. The canons authorised by means of that assembly were signed by the upper house, but not by the lower, nor were they ever authorised by the crown, although their chief framer, Archbishop Parker, was very anxious to obtain this authentication for them. (Strype’s *Parker*, ii. 60.) This quasi synodical acceptance of tradition has, therefore, by no means the real importance that is sometimes assigned to it. The church of England, in fact, rejects tradition as an authority for articles of faith, but is willing to use it for throwing light upon scriptural truth. No other use of tradition is authorised by the celebrated canon which the upper house of Convocation sanctioned in 1571. If the fathers teach any articles of faith uncontained in scripture (which is a moot-point between Protestants and Romanists), that canon makes nothing of their authority in such a case. It is only doctrine, collected out of the Bible by the Fathers, that Elizabeth’s prelacy wished to set up as a guide to parochial teachers. Their sole object was to restrain ignorance and rashness from giving themselves an unbridled licence in theological speculation. Nothing was further from the views of those admirable men who framed her terms of communion, than to open a translated Bible before the many, or the original before the few, and proclaim an unlimited licence of private judgment. Neal’s history is valuable as a dissenting comment on the ecclesiastical affairs of the times on which it treats. It did not concern the author to view the church, except as bearing upon Puritanism. His treatment of mere church-questions, accordingly, is generally superficial, and worthy of little attention. He felt, besides, an interest, as an English Protestant Dissenter, in representing the church of his day as something of an apostate from those genuine principles of his country’s reformation, which his own sect really preserved. Views of this kind are still in favour with English Dissenters;

the Lutherans, that these books are clear, full, and complete, so far as regards things necessary to salvation; and that they are to be interpreted from themselves,¹ and not after the dictates of human reason or of Christian antiquity. Several of their theologians, indeed, have been thought to extend too far the powers of human reason, in comprehending and explaining the nature of the divine mysteries; and this has led many to represent the Reformed as holding to *two* sources of religious knowledge, the holy Scriptures, and reason, or rather the capacity of the human mind. But in this matter, if we do not mistake the fact, both parties err, through eagerness to vanquish and subdue their adversaries. For, if we except the improper phraseology of certain individuals, it will appear, that the Reformed in general believe, as we do, that contradictory propositions can in no way claim acquiescence; and consequently, that doctrines made up of notions absolutely irreconcilable, must be false, and utterly incapable of challenging belief; yet they sometimes, rather contentiously, apply this principle to overthrow those Lutheran tenets which they reject.²

§ 29. The Reformed, if we restrict this appellation to those who approve the sentiments of *Calvin*, differ from the Lutherans, in regard to three subjects.—I. The doctrine of the holy supper: in which the Lutherans say, that the body and blood of Christ are *truly*, though in an inexplicable manner, presented to both the pious and the ungodly; while the Reformed suppose, that the human nature of Christ is present only by the *symbols* of it. Yet they do not all explain their doctrine in the same manner.—II. The doctrine of the eternal decrees of God, in regard to the salvation of men: the ground of which the Lutherans suppose to be, the faith or unbelief of men in Christ, foreseen by God from eternity; but the Reformed suppose it to be the free and sovereign good pleasure of God.—III. Certain rites and institutions: which the Reformed think have a tendency to superstition; but some of which the Lutherans consider as worthy of toleration, others, as useful to the Christian populace. Such are, images in churches, sacred garments for the clergy, the private confession of sins, the small circular pieces of bread,³ which are distributed, according to the ancient fashion, in the holy supper, the formula of *exorcism*, as it is called, in the sacrament of baptism; and some other things. These the Reformed would have to be abrogated; because they think that religious worship should be restored to its primitive simplicity, and the old additions to it should be wholly struck off.

§ 30. This short list of topics will be seen to be in fact a long one, by those who are aware, what a multitude of abstruse questions,

but they are the hasty views of partisans, and will not bear to be sufficiently confronted with documentary evidence. S.]

¹ [Or independently, and by comparing one part with another. *Tr.*]

² [Our author has here undoubtedly in

view the Lutheran doctrine of *consubstantiation*, which supposes the *same extended body* to be totally present in *different places*, at one and the same time. *Macl.*]

³ [Wafers. *Tr.*]

extending through the whole system of theology, these few differences produced. For the controversy respecting the mode of the presence of Christ's body and blood in the holy Supper, has afforded to polemics ample room to expatiate on the mysteries of religion, and to institute subtle discussions respecting the majesty and glory of Christ's human nature, the communication of divine attributes to it, and the proper attitude of the mind in the worship of Christ. The dispute respecting the divine decrees has brought in abundant matter for discussion, upon the divine attributes themselves, particularly justice and goodness, upon the certainty and necessity of all events, upon the connexion between human liberty and divine providence, upon the extent of God's love for men, and of the blessings procured for us by the merits of Christ, upon the nature of that divine influence which renews the mind of men, upon the perseverance of those who are appointed to eternal life in the covenant of God; and various other subjects of no small moment. Nor has the last dissension, respecting rites and institutions, been unprolific. For, besides discussions respecting the origin and antiquity of certain rites, it has produced the by no means contemptible controversies: What kind of things are they, which may be justly denominated indifferent, or neither good nor bad? How far is it proper to yield to an adversary, who contends about things in their nature indifferent? How far does Christian liberty extend? Is it lawful, for the sake of the people, to retain various ancient customs and institutions, which have a superstitious aspect, yet are capable of a good interpretation? and others of a similar nature.

§ 31. It has been debated, and sometimes with great warmth of feeling, particularly among the English and the Dutch, to whom rightfully belongs the government of the church, and the power of establishing rules and regulations in matters of religion. In these contests, those have come off victorious who maintain, that the authority to regulate sacred affairs is, by the appointment of Christ himself, vested in the church, and therefore ought, by no means, to be committed into the hands of civil magistrates; yet they admit the right of temporal sovereigns, to advise and to succour the church when in trouble, to assemble and preside in the conventions of the church, to see that her officers decree nothing prejudicial to the commonwealth, and to strengthen and confirm with their authority the decrees of the ministers of religion. The kings of England, indeed, from the time of *Henry VIII.*, have declared themselves to be supreme *heads of the church, as well in spiritual, as in temporal things*; and it is manifest, that *Henry VIII.*, and his son *Edward VI.*, attached very ample powers to this title, and considered themselves authorised to do whatever the Roman pontiffs might do.¹ But queen *Elizabeth* greatly limited this prerogative, and declared, that the authority of the kings of England did not extend to *religion* itself, and to things sacred, but only to the *persons*, who teach religion and minister in

¹ Dan. Neal's *History of the Puritans*, vol. i. ch. i. p. 11, and others.

sacred things.¹ In England, therefore, the constitution of the church is very nearly the same as that of the state. The clergy, distributed

¹ Peter Fran. le Courayer's *Supplément aux deux Ouvrages pour la défense de la validité des Ordinations Anglicanes*, cap. xv. p. 416, &c. [Courayer's book, I have not seen; but in what respects Queen Elizabeth limited the powers of the kings of England as supreme heads of the church, or when, and where, she declared, that the regal power did not extend to religion itself, and to things sacred, I am unable to determine. Burnet, indeed (*Hist. of the Reform.* iii. 492, ed. Lond. 1825), says, of the power conferred on Elizabeth, at the commencement of her reign, by the act of supremacy: 'It was in many things short of the authority that king Henry had claimed.' But he specifies no particulars; and it is well known, that Henry far transgressed the limits which he pretended to set to his own power as head of the church. Neal says of the power given to Elizabeth, by the above act of her parliament; 'Nor is it the whole that the queen claimed, who sometimes stretched her prerogative beyond it.' (*Hist. of the Puritans*, i. 168, ed. Portsm. 1816.) Hume says of this act (*Hist. of Eng.* vol. iv. ch. xxxviii. p. 151, ed. Philad. 1810), 'Though the queen was there denominated *governess*, not *head* of the church, it conveyed the same extensive power, which, under the latter title, had been exercised by her father and brother.' And he adds (*ibid.* p. 274), 'Scarcely any sovereign before Elizabeth, and none after her, carried higher, both in speculation and practice, the authority of the crown.' He likewise says (p. 290), 'Religion was a point, of which Elizabeth was, if possible, still more jealous, than of matters of state. She pretended that, in quality of supreme head or governor of the church, she was fully empowered, by her prerogative alone, to decide all questions which might arise, with regard to doctrine, discipline, or worship; and she never would allow her parliament so much as to take these points into consideration.' And the whole history of her reign appears to confirm these statements, which are so contrary to the assertions of Dr. Mosheim. See Hume, l. c. iv. 150, &c., 272, 290, &c., 292, 336, 364, 462.—The powers of the English monarchs, as the heads of the church, from Henry VIII. to Charles I., are thus defined, by Mr. Neal, in his *Hist. of the Puritans*, vol. i. ch. iv. p. 169—172. 'They never pretended to be spiritual persons; or to exercise any part of the ecclesiastical function, in their own person; they neither preached nor administered the sacraments,' &c. 'But abating this point, it appears very probable, that all the juris-

diction and authority, claimed by the pope, as the head of the church,—was transferred to the king, by the act of supremacy,—as far as was consistent with the laws of the land then in being; though since, it has undergone some abatements.' He then proceeds to the following specifications. 'I. The kings and queens of England claimed authority in matters of faith, and to be the ultimate judges of what is agreeable or repugnant to the word of God.' 'II. With regard to discipline, the king is the supreme and ultimate judge in the spiritual courts by his delegates, as he is in the courts of common law by his judges.' 'III. As to rites and ceremonies, the Act of Uniformity (1 Eliz. cap. i.) says expressly, *that the queen's majesty, by advice of her ecclesiastical commissioners, or of her metropolitan, may ordain and publish such ceremonies or rites, as may be most for the advancement of God's glory, and the edifying of the church.* Accordingly, her majesty published her injunctions, without sending them into convocation or parliament, and erected a court of *High Commission*, for ecclesiastical causes, consisting of commissioners of her own nomination, to see them put in execution. Nay, so jealous was Queen Elizabeth of this branch of her prerogative, that she would not suffer her high court of parliament to pass any bill for the amendment or alteration of the ceremonies of the church, it being (as she said) an invasion of her prerogative.' 'IV. The kings of England claimed the sole power of the nomination of bishops; and the deans and chapters were obliged to choose those whom their majesties named, under penalty of a *præmunire*; and after they were chosen and consecrated, they might not act but by commission from the crown.' 'V. No convocation, or synods of the clergy, can assemble, but by a writ or precept from the crown; and when assembled, they can do no business, without the king's letters patent, appointing them the particular subjects they are to debate upon; and, after all, their canons are of no force without the royal sanction.' 'Upon the whole it is evident, by the express words of several statutes (31 Hen. VIII. cap. xvii. 1 Eliz. c. i.) that all jurisdiction, ecclesiastical as well as civil, was vested in the king, and taken away from the bishops, except by delegation from him. The king was chief in the determination of all causes in the church; he had authority to make laws, ceremonies, and constitutions, and without him no such laws, ceremonies, or constitutions, are or ought to be of force. And, lastly, all appeals, which before had

into two houses, called the upper and lower houses of *Convocation*, are assembled by the order of the king, and a summons from the archbishop of Canterbury, and they decree, by common consent, whatever the interests of the church are thought to demand: and the king and the parliament give to their decrees the sanctions and authority of laws.¹ Yet this subject has been much controverted; the king and the parliament putting one construction upon the ecclesiastical constitution, and the rulers of the church, particularly those who think the church to be an independent body, giving a different construction of it. And in fact, the ecclesiastical constitution of England

been made to Rome, are for ever hereafter to be made to His Majesty's chancellor, to be ended and determined, as the manner now is, by delegates.' *Tr.*]

Elizabeth thus authentically explained her views of the supremacy, in *An Admonition to simple men, deceived by the malicious*, subjoined to her *Injunctions* of 1559. *Her Majesty neither doth, nor ever will challenge any authority than that was challenged and lately used by the said noble kings of famous memory, king Henry the Eighth and king Edward the Sixth, which is, and ever was of ancient time due to the imperial crown of this realm, that is, under God, to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these her realms, dominions, and countries, of what estate, either ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they be, so as no other foreign power shall, or ought to have, any superiority over them.* Upon this Collier observes, 'Had this *Admonition*, as 't is called, been passed into an Act of Parliament, or the same explanation at least been made by succeeding princes, it might possibly have not been unserviceable.' (*Eccl. Hist.* ii. 433.) The late Mr. Butler also said, 'Were it quite clear, that the interpretation contended for' (by those who take the *Injunctions* for their guide) 'is the true interpretation of the oath, and quite clear also, that the oath was and is thus universally interpreted by the nation, then the author conceives, that there might be strong ground to contend, that it was consistent with catholic principles to take either the oath of supremacy which was prescribed by Elizabeth, or that which is used at present.' (*Hist. Mem. of the Eng. Cath.* i. 162.) 'How odious soever this oath, though thus qualified, has always been at the court of Rome, yet it did not fail to reconcile most of the Catholics to Queen Elizabeth. Fecknam, abbot of Westminster, and so staunch a Catholic, that Mr. Fennell and Father le Quien honour him as a confessor, made no scruple of approving it. For in a confession of faith, signed with his own hand, he declares, that he is ready to take the oath in that sense, when it shall be tendered to him

by a lawful authority. Fecknam's offer, though never put in execution by him, had a great influence upon the rest. For some years before Queen Elizabeth's death, most of the Catholic secular priests took the oath to that princess and her successor; and notwithstanding the clamours of Bellarmin and the Jesuits, they judged, that, by acknowledging the ecclesiastical power of the kings of England, they only attributed to them an authority which might restrain the power of the pope, without any real encroachment upon the functions of the priesthood.' (Courayer's *Defence of the Dissertation on the Validity of the English Ordinations*, Lond. 1728, ii. 319.) Sir Roger Twisden shows that, in fact, Elizabeth's claim of supremacy had been acted upon from the very beginning of the English monarchy, and that a similar claim had been made by the kings of France. (*Hist. Vindiciæ of the Ch. of Engl. in point of Schism*, 105.) It is obviously fair and reasonable, to take that view of the royal supremacy, which the statute will warrant, which is taken in Elizabeth's *Injunctions*, was acquiesced in by the more moderate of her Romish subjects, and which is maintained by all the authorities of any weight in the church of England. Against the soundness of such a view, some appearance of a disposition, or some occasional attempt, to strain the royal prerogative, is no bar whatever. Nor are doubts of its soundness expressed or insinuated by writers unfavourable to the church of England, entitled to any great attention. The Romanist, the dissenter, and the infidel, however personally estimable, and generally well-informed, all feel an interest in making out a good case for declining communion with her, and have seldom besides entered more deeply into her peculiar affairs than is requisite for that very purpose. S.]

¹ Jo. Cosin, *De Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Religione et Disciplina*, c. viii. p. 53: in Tho. Smith's *Vitæ Eruditiss. Virorum*, Lond. 1707, 4to. Dav. Wilkins, *De Veteri et Moderna Synodi Anglic. Constitutione*; in his *Concilia Magn. Britann.* i. 7, &c.

has not a fixed and uniform character, but is rather dependent on custom and usage, and the fluctuations of time, than on established laws.

§ 32. The question, what is the best form and organisation of a Christian church? produced likewise warm contests, which hitherto no means have been found able to decide. The Genevans, guided by *Calvin*, judged it proper, that the private affairs of single churches should be directed by a body of elders or *presbyters*, all equals; that matters of a more public and important character should be decided in conventions of delegated elders in the provinces; and that the interests of the whole church, and matters of special difficulty, should be discussed, as anciently, in a council of the whole church.¹ Nor did the Genevans omit any exertions to persuade all their confederates to embrace this system. But the English judged the old system of church government to be very holy, and therefore not to be changed: this system commits the inspection and care of certain minor provinces exclusively to the bishop; under the bishops are the presbyters of single churches; under the presbyters are the ministers or deacons; and the common interests of the whole body are discussed in assemblies of the bishops and those next in rank to them. And this system, with some exceptions, is adopted by the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, who belong to the Reformed church.² This single disagreement, as each party traced the origin of its own system to *Jesus Christ* and his apostles, has been most effective in dividing the whole Reformed church into sects: and, in fact, it rent the English branch

¹ [Maclaine thinks Mosheim has here made a great mistake, in specifying *three* judicatories as provided by the Genevan plan; while, in fact, the Genevan republic had but two ecclesiastical bodies, the *Venerable Company* of the pastors and professors, and the *Consistory*. But there is no need of severe criticism. The *Presbyterian* system is simply this, that single churches should each have a judicatory, composed of all the elders belonging to it; that this judicatory be responsible to one or more higher judicatories, composed of delegated elders; and that the highest judicatory be that of a national synod, constituted in the same manner. Where the state is very small, as that of Geneva, there would be but one delegated body, in which each individual church would be represented. But in larger states, as France, Holland, and Scotland, there would be a gradation of three or four distinct judicatories, each higher composed of delegates from the next lower. In France there were (1) Consistories, or church sessions, (2) the Elderships or Presbyteries, (3) the provincial Councils, and (4) the national Synods; all formed on this plan. In Scotland, originally, the lowest judicatory was that of three or four contiguous churches united, then the provincial synods, and last

the General Assembly. But, at an early period, each church came to have its distinct session; and this produced a gradation of *four* judicatories in Scotland. But while the Reformed admitted of no higher judicatory than a national council, or considered the church of each country as an independent body, they allowed of a connexion between national churches. Thus the national synods of the French church, in this century, held a continued correspondence by letters and envoys, with the church of Geneva; and also regularly sent representatives to the Reformed church of the Low Countries; and received delegates from them. And in the next century, the Reformed Dutch church invited the Reformed churches of France, Germany, England, &c. to assist them, by their representatives, in the national synod of Dort. So at the present day, in the United States of America, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church annually exchanges delegates with the General Associations of the New-England States; and also holds correspondence with some transatlantic bodies. *Tr.*]

² See the *Epistola de Ordinatione et Successione Episcopali in Unitate Fratrum Bohemorum conservata*; in Christ. Matth. Pfaff's *Institut. Juris Ecclcs.* p. 410.

into two factions, to the nation's great injury. But, although many would have had it otherwise, the prudence of certain excellent individuals prevented the evil from spreading abroad, and destroying the fellowship of foreigners with the English. These men disseminated the principle, that *Jesus Christ* prescribed no definite form of government for his church; and therefore that every nation may frame such a system for itself as the circumstances of the country require, provided it be not prejudicial to the truth, nor tend to the restoration of superstition.¹

§ 33. *Calvin's* opinion was, that such as led vicious and ungodly lives ought to be deprived of communion in divine ordinances; and that profligates and slaves to pleasure were also to be restrained by the laws of the state. In this matter he differed from *Zwingle*, who ascribed all power to the magistrates alone, and would not allow to the ministers of religion the right to exclude transgressors from the church, or to deprive them of sacred rites.² And so great was the influence of *Calvin* at Geneva, that he was able, though with great perils, and amidst perpetual conflicts with the patrons of licentiousness, to establish there a rigorous system of moral discipline, supported and exercised with the countenance of the laws; and by the ecclesiastical court, or the *Consistory*, to exclude the abandoned, first from the church, and then from the city, or to restrain them by other punishments.³ The clergy in the cantons of Switzerland wished to copy after this discipline of *Calvin*, and to obtain the same power

¹ Here may be consulted with advantage, the discussions on the subject, between Fred. Spanheim and John van der Waeyen, in the works of Spanheim, t. ii. l. viii. ix. p. 1055, &c. The same opinion is said to have been embraced by the British divines who lived near the times of the reformation; and to have been first abandoned by John Whitgift. Dan. Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, iii. 140. [This statement is incorrect, as respects Bishop Whitgift. Mr. Neal says (iii. 156, ed. Portsm. 1817), 'Most of our first reformers were so far in these sentiments' (those of the *Erastians*), 'as to maintain, that no one form of church government is prescribed in Scripture, as an invariable rule for future ages; as Cranmer, Redmayn, Cox, &c.; and Archbishop Whitgift, in his controversy with Cartwright, delivers the same opinion: "*I deny* (says he) *that the Scripture has set down any one certain form of church government to be perpetual.*" The chief patrons of this scheme in the (Westminster) Assembly, were Dr. Lightfoot, Mr. Colman, Mr. Selden, Mr. Whitlock; and in the House of Commons, besides Selden and Whitlock, Oliver St. John, Esq., Sir Thomas Widdrington, John Crew, Esq., Sir John Hipsley, and others of the greatest names.' *Tr.*]

² See the excellent letter of Rud. Gualther, in Jo. Conr. Fuesslin's *Centuria I.*

Epistolar. a Reformatore. Helvet. scriptar. p. 478, where he says: 'Excommunicationem neque Zwinglius—neque Bullingerus unquam probarunt, et—obstiterunt iis qui eam aliquando voluerunt introducere.—Basilie quidem Ecolampadius, multum dissuadente Zwinglio, instituerat—sed adeo non durabilis fuit illa constitutio, ut Ecolampadius illam abrogavit,' &c. Compare p. 90.

³ Nothing caused Calvin more troubles, cabals, and perils, at Geneva, than his determined resolution to purge the church of transgressors, and to restrain and punish such as violated the rules established by the church, or by the *Consistory* which represented the church. See his life, written by Beza, and prefixed to his letters; the notes to the second volume of Jac. Spon's *Histoire de Genève*; and Calvin himself, in his letters, especially in those which he wrote to James de Falais or de Bourgogne, published at Amsterdam, 1744, 8vo. pp. 126, 127, 132, 153, 157. The party at Geneva, which defended the former licentiousness of morals, not only with their tongues, but also by their actions, and with force of arms, and which Calvin called the sect of the *Libertines*, was very powerful. But Calvin's resolution was also invincible, and his rigorous discipline triumphed.

over transgressors; but their desires and efforts were in vain. For the people in the cantons of Berne, Zurich, Bâle, and elsewhere, would by no means allow a removal of the boundaries set by *Zwingle* to the jurisdiction of the church, or the enlargement of its powers and prerogatives.¹

§ 34. That all branches of learning, both sacred and profane, were everywhere successfully cultivated, among the Reformed in this century, is well known; and the numerous monuments of their excellent geniuses, which still exist, allow no one to be ignorant of the fact. *Zwingle* was disposed to exclude philosophy from the church:² but the succeeding Swiss doctors soon discovered, that in such a world as this, and especially in the disputes on religious subjects, a knowledge of it could not be dispensed with. Hence, when *Calvin* erected the academy of Geneva, in 1558, he at once provided for it a professor of philosophy. But this professor was required to explain in his lectures none but the Aristotelian philosophy, which then reigned in all the schools.³ Nor did the other universities of the Reformed suffer a different philosophy to be taught in them. Yet at Bâle, the system of *Peter Ramus*, for a time, was by some preferred to that of Aristotle.⁴

§ 35. The Reformed church, from its very commencement, had many expositors of the Scriptures, and several of them were ingenious and excellent. *Zwingle's* labours in explanation of most of the books of the New Testament, are not to be despised. He was followed by *Henry Bullinger*, *John Œcolampadius*, *Wolfgang Musculus*, and many others, not his equals indeed in genius and learning, yet all of them meriting some praise. But the first rank among the interpreters of this age is deservedly assigned to *John Calvin*, who endeavoured to expound nearly the whole of the sacred volume; and to *Theodore Beza*, whose New Testament, illustrated with learned remarks of various kinds, especially critical ones, has been often published, and has not to this day lost all the renown and estimation in which it was formerly held. It is an honour to most of these expositors, that, disregarding allegories and mystical interpretations, they endeavour to ascertain the literal import of the language used by the inspired men; but, on the other hand, some of them, and in particular *Calvin*, have been reproached, because they venture to refer to Jewish affairs some predictions of the ancient prophets, which relate to *Jesus Christ*, and place him, as it were, before the eye; and thus have deprived Christianity of important corroboration.⁵

¹ See, for example, the *Commutations at Lausanne*, in the *Museum Helveticum*, ii. 119, &c. The disputes on this subject, among the people of the Palatinate, who wished to adopt the Genevan discipline, are described by *Henry Alting*, in his *Historia Eccl. Palatina*; and by *Struve*, in his *Hist. Eccl. Palat. German.* p. 212, &c.

² *Zwingle*, in the dedication of his book on True and False Religion to Francis I., king of France, says expressly, p. 12, 'Philosophiæ interdictum est a Christi

scholis: at isti (the Sorbonists) fecerunt eam cœlestis verbi magistratam.'

³ *Theodore Beza's Epist. Theolog.* xxxvi. p. 156. 'Certum nobis ac constitutum est, et in ipsis tradendis Logicis et in ceteris explicandis disciplinis, ab Aristotelis sententia ne tantillum quidem deflectere.'

⁴ See *Caspar Brandt's Vita Jacobi Arminii*, and the notes we formerly annexed to it, pp. 8, 12, 13.

⁵ See *Ægid. Hunnius, Calvinus Judæizans*, Wittemb. 1595, 8vo.; to which David

§ 36. The state of dogmatic theology was much the same among the Swiss and the other Reformed that it was among the Lutherans. *Zwingle* early collected and digested the principal doctrines of Christianity, in his little book *on true and false Religion*. Afterwards, *John Calvin* produced a much larger and more perfect work of this sort, entitled *Institutes of the Christian Religion*; which long held the same rank and authority in nearly all countries of the Reformed church, that *Melancthon's* Common-place Book did among the Lutherans. *Calvin* was succeeded by many writers of Common-place Books, some more prolix, and others more concise; as *Musculus*, *Peter Martyr*, *Piscator*, and others. The earlier the writer in this department, the less he has of subtlety and philosophical distinctions; and in this they resemble *Calvin*, whose *Institutes* are written in a perspicuous and elegant style, and have nothing abstruse and difficult to be comprehended, in the arguments or mode of reasoning. But after a while, the Aristotelico-Scholastic philosophy, which was everywhere inculcated, invaded also the fields of theology; and it rendered them barren, thorny, and frightful, by means of its barbarous terms, captious interrogatories, minute distinctions, and great labyrinth of useless matter.¹

Paræus opposed his *Calvinus Orthodoxus*, Neostadii, 1595, 8vo. [Even the Catholics have done *Calvin* the justice to rank him among the good commentators. *Richard Simon*, in his *Histoire Crit. du Vieux Test.* p. 434, places him above *Luther* as to discrimination and soundness of judgment; though he ascribes to *Luther* more knowledge of the Hebrew. He adds: 'Au reste, *Calvin* ayant l'esprit fort élevé, on trouve dans tous ses Commentaires sur l'Ecriture un je-ne-sçai-quoi qui plaît d'abord, et comme il s'étoit principalement appliqué à connoître l'homme, il a rempli ses livres d'une morale qui touche.' *Schl.*]

¹ Yet what is called the *scholastic* mode of treating theology appears to have entered into the Reformed church, somewhat later than into our church. At least, it was quite recent in Holland at the time of the council of Dort [A.D. 1619]. In this council, *John Maccovius*, a professor at Franeker, and initiated in all the mysteries of the philosophic schools, was accused by *Sibr. Lubbert*, of corrupting the truths of revelation. The case being investigated, the judges decided, that *Maccovius* had not indeed perverted Christian doctrines, but that he employed a mode of teaching of less simplicity than was proper; for he followed rather the example of the scholastic doctors, than that of the Holy Spirit. We will give the decision of the council in the language of *Walter Balcanquhall*, in his epistle to *Sir Dudley Carleton* (which is the 350th of the *Epistolæ Ecclesiasticæ*, published by *Phil. Limborch*, p. 574), 'Maccovium — nullius hæreseos

reum teneri — peccasse eum, quod quibusdam ambiguis et obscuris Scholasticis phrasibus usus sit: quod Scholasticum docendi modum conetur in Belgicis Academiis introducere.—Monendum esse eum, ut cum Spiritu Sancto loquatur, non cum Bellarmino et Suarezio.' *Maccovius* did not obey these admonitions; as is manifest from his writings, which are full of scholastic wit and knotty discussions. He, therefore, seems to have first taught the Dutch to philosophize on revealed religion. Yet he had associates, as *William Ames*, and others. And it must be true, that this philosophic or scholastic form of theology, was extensively prevalent among the Reformed, anterior to the synod of Dort, if that be true, which *Simon Episcopius* states in his last oration to his disciples at Leyden; namely, that he had studiously avoided it, and had thereby incurred the violent hatred of the other doctors. He says (in *Phil. Limborch's Life of Episcopius*, p. 123), 'Videbam veritatem multarum et maximarum rerum in ipsa Scriptura sacra, elaboratis humana industria phrasibus, ingeniosis vocularum fictionibus, locorum communium artificiosis texturis, exquisitis terminorum ac formularum inventionibus adeo involutam, perplexam, et intricatam redditam esse, ut *Ædipo* sepe opus esset ad *Sphingem* illam Theologicam enodandam. Ita est, et hinc primæ lacrymæ.' And, a little after, p. 124, he adds, 'Reducendam itaque terminorum Apostolicorum et cuivis obviorem simplicitatem semper sequendam putavi, et sequestrandas, quas Academiæ et Scholæ tanquam proprias sibi

§ 37. Their instructions for regulating the life and conduct are annexed for the most part, by the Reformed theologians of this age, to their doctrines of faith: which was according to the example of *Calvin*, whom they nearly all follow as their guide. For he, in the last chapter but one of his *Institutes*, treats of the civil power or the *government of the state*; and in the last chapter, of the *life and conduct of a Christian*: but he is less full than the importance and copiousness of the subject demand. Those, in other respects, excellent men, were prevented from labouring to elucidate and systematise this branch of sacred knowledge, by the same causes that diverted our theologians from it; and especially by the tumult of perpetual controversy. It is conceded by eminent divines among the Reformed, that *William Perkins*, an Englishman,¹ first undertook to explain in a more accurate manner the science of practical theology, which *Calvin* and his contemporaries had left in a rude and imperfect state. With him was associated, among the Hollanders, *William Teling*,² who wrote however in the Dutch language. In emulation of them, *William Ames*, an Englishman,³ but a theologian of Franeker, in Holland, undertook to compose a complete system of *Practical Theology*.⁴ Afterwards, others prosecuted the subject.

vindicant, Logicas philosophicasque speculationes et dictiones.

¹ [Wm. Perkins was born in 1558, educated at Cambridge, where he became fellow of his college, and also a parish priest. He died in 1602, aged 44. In early life, he was profane, prodigal, and given to intemperance; but when reformed, he became eminent for piety and an exemplary life. He was a Puritan, and as such repeatedly persecuted; was strictly Calvinistic, a very popular and faithful preacher, and a voluminous writer. His works, which were printed at Geneva, 1603, in 3 vols. fol., have been much read and admired on the continent. See *Brook's Lives of the Puritans*, ii, 129, &c. His chief works on practical theology are *Anatomy of the Human Conscience*; *On the right way of Living and Dying*; *On the nature of Repentance*, &c. *Tr.*]

² [Teling died in 1629, at Haarlem, where he was a preacher. His practical writings bear the marks of that age, and generally have allegorical titles; e.g. *The pole star of genuine piety*. At this day, they are useful only in the history of practical theology. *Schl.*]

³ [In the original, Dr. Ames is erroneously called a Scotsman. He was born in Norfolk, in 1576; educated at Cambridge under Mr. Perkins; became a fellow of his college; was a zealous Puritan, and persecuted in 1610. He fled into Holland; preached a while in the English church at the Hague; was made professor of divinity at Franeker; resigned the office, at the end

of twelve years, on account of his health, and retired to Rotterdam, where he died in 1633, aged 57. His widow and children removed to New-England, to which he had intended to remove. He was learned, acute, soundly Calvinistic, and a strict Independent. His writings are numerous, chiefly polemic and doctrinal, and written in a clear, concise, and nervous Latin style. See Middleton's *Biographia Evangelica*, iii. 45, &c., and *Brook's Lives of the Puritans*, ii. 405, &c. *Tr.*]

⁴ See the dedication and preface to *William Ames'* formerly very famous work, *de Conscientia et ejus jure*. In p. iii. of the preface, among other things, he says, 'Quod hæc pars prophetiæ (i. e. practical theology) hactenus minus fuerit excultâ, hoc inde fuit, quod primipilares nostri perpetuo in acie adversus hostes pugnare, fidem propugnare et aream ecclesiæ purgare, necessitate quadam cogeantur, ita ut agros et vineas plantare et rigare non potuerint ex voto, sicut bello fervente usu venire solet.' His *Exhortation*, addressed to the theological students at Franeker, and subjoined to the above work, is worthy of perusal. From this address we may learn, among other things, that in the universities of the Reformed, the chief attention was then bestowed on dogmatic and polemic theology; and that practical theology lay neglected: 'Theologi præclare se instructos putant ad omnes officii sui partes, si dogmata tantum intelligant.—Neque tamen omnia dogmata scrutantur, sed illa sola, quæ præcipue solent agitari et in controversiam vocari.'

§ 38. There did not arise, in this century, so many sects and religious contests among the Reformed, as there were among us; which, while they may esteem it much to their credit, may be easily traced to adequate causes, by one acquainted with the history of the Reformed church.¹ Yet *John Calvin* mentions and confutes one very pernicious faction, which was far worse than any of ours: namely, the sect of the *Libertines*, or the *Spirituals*; which originated from *Anthony Pockes*, *Gerhard Ruff*, *Quintin*, and others, its leaders and founders, in Flanders; and thence passed into France, where it obtained countenance from *Margaret*, the queen of Navarre, and sister of *Francis I.*, and found patrons likewise in other sections of the Reformed church.² These *Spirituals*, if we carefully consider all that *Calvin* and others have written against them, not always with sufficient perspicuity (for I do not know that any of their own writings are extant), maintained, that God Himself works all things in all men, or is the cause and author of all human actions; that, therefore, the common notions of a difference between good actions and bad, are false and vain; that men cannot, properly speaking, commit sin; that religion consists in the union of the rational soul, or the spirit, with God; that if a person attain this, by contemplation and directing his mind upward, he may freely obey the instincts of his nature; for, whatever he may do, he will be innocent, and after death will be united to God. These doctrines are so similar to the views of the ancient *Beghards*, or *Brethren of the free spirit*, that I have very little doubt, these *Spirituals* were their descendants; and the fact, that this sect originated in *Flanders*, which in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was full of this sort of people, corroborates the supposition.

§ 39. Totally different in character from the *Spiritual Libertines*, though not unfrequently confounded with them, were those *Libertines* of Geneva, with whom *John Calvin* had to contend fiercely all his life. These were no other than citizens of Geneva, who could not endure *Calvin's* rigorous discipline; and who defended, in opposition to his regulations, with craft and violence, with factions, insults, and contumelies, the dissolute morals of their progenitors, their brothels, and carousals, their sports and frolics; all of which, as well as other

¹ [Dr. Maclaine says here: 'Dr. Mosheim ought to have given us a hint of his manner of accounting for this, to avoid the suspicion of having been somewhat at a loss for a favourable solution.' Schlegel, therefore, subjoins the following: 'The Reformed church was at first small, and more closely knit together than the Lutheran; and of course there could not arise in it such wide-spreading contentions. The leading persons also were able so to temper their disagreements, that they could not break out into a great flame. Zwingle and Calvin were men of great influence, who could arrest all contentions by as much power as Luther could. But Melancthon, who succeeded

Luther, had not such influence; and when he was dead, there was no one to be found in our church competent to extinguish the fire which, during his lifetime, had been smoking in the ashes.' A better solution may be found, I think, in the spirit and the religious principles of the two communities. For in the English church, which most resembled the Lutheran in these respects, there was as violent and as pernicious contention as among the Lutherans. Tr.]

² See Calvin's *Instructio adversus fanaticam et furiosam Sectarum Libertinorum, qui se Spirituales vocant*; in his *Tractatus Theologici*, p. 599, &c.

indications of an irreligious spirit, *Calvin* most severely condemned and chastised.¹ There were, moreover, in this turbulent faction, persons not only dissolute in their lives, but also scoffers and despisers of all religion. Such a character was *James Gruet*; who not only assailed *Calvin* with all his power, and called him *bishop of Ascoli*,² and *the new pope*, but also discarded and opposed the divinity of the Christian religion, the immortality of the soul, the distinction between right and wrong, and whatever else was most sacred in the view of Christians; for which he was punished capitally, in the year 1550.³

§ 40. *Calvin* had also at Geneva controversies with some who could not digest his doctrines, especially that gloomy one of absolute decrees. Being a man of excessive ardour, and too jealous of his own reputation, he would not suffer these people to reside at Geneva: nay, in the heat of controversy, yielding to his passions, he frequently accused them of crimes and enormities, from which they have been acquitted by the judgment of posterity.⁴ Among these was *Sebastian Castalio*, master of the public school at Geneva; a man not indeed free from all faults, yet honest, and distinguished for erudition and the elegance of his genius. As he would not praise all that *Calvin* and his colleagues did and taught; and in particular, as he rejected *Calvin's* and *Beza's* doctrine of pure and absolute predestination, he was required, in 1544, to resign his office, and go into exile. But the authorities of Bâle received the exile, and gave him the Greek professorship in their university.⁵

§ 41. Like his, was the fate of *Jerome Bolsec*, a French Carmelite, but a man greatly inferior to *Castalio* in learning and genius. He came to Geneva, allured by the Reformation, to which he was inclined; and there established himself as a physician. But in the year 1551, he most imprudently declaimed with vehemence, in a public assembly, against the doctrine of God's absolute decrees. For this he was cast into prison; and at last, was compelled to

¹ See Jac. Spon's *Histoire de Genève*, ii. 44, in the notes of the editor.

² [The import of this title of reproach, or the ground of its pertinence in the view of Gruet, is not explained by the historians who mention it; nor was Schlegel able satisfactorily to account for it. See his long note. *Tr.*]

³ See Spon, l. c. ii. 47, the note.

⁴ We may venture to say this, at the present day, since the Genevans themselves, and other doctors of the Reformed church, ingenuously confess, that the great talents of *Calvin* were attended by no small defects of character, which, however, they think should be overlooked, on account of his extraordinary merits. See the notes to Spon's *Histoire de Genève*, ii. 110, &c., and elsewhere; also the preface to the *Lettres de Calvin à Jacques de Bourgogne*, p. xix. &c.

⁵ See Jac. Uyttenbogard's *Ecclesiastical*

History, written in Dutch, pt. ii. p. 70—73; where he endeavours to prove the innocence of *Castalio*; Bayle's *Dictionnaire*, i. 792, &c. [article *Castalion*; which is elaborate, and appears to be candid. *Tr.*] Paul Colomeseus, *Italia Orientalis*, p. 99, and others. [See Jo. Conrad Fuesslin's *Lebensgeschichte Seb. Castellio*. Francf. and Lips. 1774, 8vo. *Schl.* — *Castalio* was born in Dauphiny or Savoy, 1515, and spent his days at Strasbourg, Geneva, and Bâle; where he died in 1563. He was an elegant Latin and Greek scholar, and wrote much, particularly translations into Latin and French. His Latin translation of the Bible is his most important work. He denied unconditional election; considered the Canticles as an uninspired book; and rejected *Calvin's* opinion respecting Christ's descent into hell. These were his chief faults. *Tr.*]

leave the city. He returned to his native country and to the Romish religion, which he had before renounced: and now he assailed the reputation and the life and conduct of *Calvin* and his colleague *Beza* in the most abusive publications.¹ From the unfortunate treatment of *Bolsec*, originated the enmity between *Calvin* and *James of Burgundy*, an illustrious descendant from the dukes of Burgundy, and a great patron and intimate friend of *Calvin*, who had been led by his attachment to him, to fix his residence at Geneva. *James* employed *Bolsec* as his personal physician; and therefore supported him all that he could, when borne down by the influence of *Calvin*, to prevent him from being entirely ruined. This so exasperated *Calvin*, that to avoid his resentment, *James* thought proper to retire from Geneva into the country.²

§ 42. *Bernardin Ochin*, an Italian of Siena, and formerly vicar-general of the order of Capuchins, a man of a teeming and subtle wit, who preached to an Italian congregation at Zurich, was, in the year 1563, condemned and ordered into exile, by the decision of the whole Reformed church of Switzerland. For, in his books, which were numerous, he not only put forth other opinions at variance with such as were commonly entertained, but this in particular, that the law of marriage with only one wife, was not without exceptions in certain cases. His works show that he speculated on many subjects more boldly than that age would permit, and in a different manner from the Swiss theologians. Yet there are those who maintain, that his errors, at the time when, being very old and indigent, he was compelled to forsake Switzerland, were not so great as to deserve to be punished with banishment. He retired into Poland, and there united with the Anti-trinitarians and Anabaptists. He died there in the year 1564.³

§ 43. The very men who punished with such severity the audacity of those that considered some things to require alteration in the doctrines commonly received, were on the other hand inclined for nothing but mildness and gentleness in those contests which broke out with so much violence between the English *Puritans* and *Episcopalians*. Their best regards, indeed, were bestowed upon the *Puritans*, who contended for the doctrines and discipline of the Swiss; but still they had a brotherly affection for the *Episcopalians*, and were desirous of communicating the same feeling to their confederates, the *Puritans*, although the former, in claiming a divine origin for its own discipline, did very great injustice to the

¹ See Bayle's *Dictionnaire*, i. 592, article *Bolsec*. Jac. Spon's *Histoire de Genève*, the note, ii. 55. *Bibliothèque Raisonnée*, xxxii. 446, and xxxiv. 409.

² See the *Lettres de Calvin à Jacques de Bourgoigne*, pref. p. viii. &c. *Bibliothèque Raisonnée*, xxxii. 444, and xxxiv. 406.

³ Zach. Boverius, *Annales Capucinarum*; and from these Annals, the author of the book entitled: *La Guerre Séraphique, ou*

Histoire des Périls qu'a couru la Barbe des Capucins, l. ii. p. 147, l. iii. p. 192, 230, &c. *Observationes Halcnscs Latine*, t. iv. obs. xx. p. 406, t. v. obs. i. p. 3, &c. Bayle's *Dictionnaire*, iii. 2105. Christ. Sand's *Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitar.* p. iv. &c. Nicéron, *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire des Hommes illustres*, xix. 166, &c. [See the sketch of his life, above, sect. ii. c. vii. § 5, note. Tr.]

Reformed body generally, which thus was left with scarcely the name and the rights of a true church. This moderation was the result of prudence, and flowed from the fear of offending a high-spirited and prosperous nation, and a most powerful queen, whose influence governed even Holland also; and it was prompted, finally, by the danger of a destructive schism among the Reformed. For, indeed, it is one thing to coerce and to cast out feeble and unarmed individuals, who are disposed to disturb the peace of a city, by advancing opinions, not perhaps absolutely absurd nor of dangerous tendency, yet really novel; and quite another thing to provoke and drive to a secession a noble and most flourishing church which may be defective in some respects. Moreover, the ground of the dissension,¹ hitherto, did not seem to be religion itself; but the external forms of religion and the constitution of the church. Yet soon afterwards, some of the great principles of religion itself were brought under discussion.

§ 44. No one can deny, or be ignorant of the fact, that the Reformed church, in this age, abounded in very eminent men, who were distinguished for their acquisitions of knowledge, both human and divine. Besides *Ulric Zwingli*, *John Calvin*, and *Theodore Beza*, men of inexhaustible talents, the following have acquired by their writings immortal praise, namely, *John Eccolampadius*, *Henry Bullinger*, *William Farel*, *Peter Viret*, *Peter Martyr*, *Theodore Bibliander*, *Wolfgang Musculus*, *Conrad Pellican*, *Lewis Lavater*, *Rudolph Hospinian*, *Zacharias Ursinus*, *Thomas Cranmer*, archbishop of Canterbury, *Stephen Szegedinus*, and many others; whose names and merits may be learned from the common writers of literary history, especially *Melchior Adam*, *Anthony Wood*, *Gerard Brandt*, *Daniel Neal*, an Englishman, the very learned and industrious author of the *History of the Puritans*, and other writers.²

¹ [In England. *Tr.*]

² [All the larger biographical Dictionaries may be consulted; and also the *Encyclopædias*, particularly that of Dr. Rees. To these may be added, Middleton's *Biographia Evangelica*, and Brook's *Lives of the Puritans*; besides the numerous biographies of individual men. The means of becoming acquainted with the lives, characters, and writings of distinguished modern theologians, are so abundant, and the extent of the subject so great, that full lists of all the authors of each century will not be given in the notes to the centuries in this volume, as in those prior to the reformation. *Tr.*] Mosheim, as a foreigner, could not be expected to know a great deal about Neal. The following account of his work, so far as Elizabeth's reign goes, which is all that concerns this century, may be advantageously appended. The author's name is an abundant guarantee for its research and ability, also for no excessive leaning towards the church of England. '*Neal's History of*

the Puritans is almost wholly compiled, as far as this reign is concerned, from Strype, and from a manuscript written by some Puritan about the time. It was answered by Madox, afterwards bishop of Worcester, in a *Vindication of the Church of England*, published anonymously in 1733. Neal replied with tolerable success; but Madox's book is still a useful corrective. Both, however, were, like most controversialists, prejudiced men, loving the interests of their respective factions better than truth, and not very scrupulous about misrepresenting an adversary. But Neal had got rid of the intolerant spirit of the Puritans, while Madox labours to justify every act of Whitgift and Parker.' (Hallam's *Constitutional History of England*, London, 1832, i. 280.) It was impossible that Neal could justify the intolerance of Puritanism. It made a figure, by means of that defeat, under Elizabeth, which all parties have long condemned. In the next century, it showed more disadvantageously still. It is besides impossible

with later Dissenters to justify the intolerance of Elizabethan Puritanism, because they would thus condemn themselves. The organised confederacy which Elizabeth's non-conformists wanted to force upon the country was meant to crush all those independent congregations, and various shades of belief unsanctioned by itself, which make up the aggregate of modern Dissent. Hence, the surrender of Puritanical intolerance was no merit on Neal's part. He could not help it. Nor was Madox blame-

able for advocating the policy of Parker and Whitgift, even upon grounds that men who compliment themselves as liberal, would be constrained to approve. The acts which have drawn down so much obloquy upon those eminent primates, were the occasional enforcement of the law against clergymen who lived by the establishment, and strove to undermine it all the while; for the purpose of raising upon its ruins an intolerant pontifical democracy. S.]

CHAPTER III.

*HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

§ 1. General conformity during Elizabeth's first years—§ 2. Acts against Romanism—§ 3. The Seminaries—§ 4. The Jesuits—§ 5. The Puritans—§ 6. The vesture controversy—§ 7. The Disciplinarians—§ 8. Cartwright—§ 9. The Brownists—§ 10. The Barrowists—§ 11. Doctrinal Puritanism—§ 12. The Sabbatarian controversy—§ 13. Firmness of the queen—§ 14. Puritanical bias of the ministers and royal favourites—§ 15. Abp. Parker—§ 16. Abp. Grindal—§ 17. Abp. Whitgift—§ 18. Religious persecution—§ 19. Executions of Protestant Non-conformists.

§ 1. QUEEN ELIZABETH, in adopting the religious policy of her half-brother, Edward, was disheartened at first with no great appearance of opposition. The protestants were necessarily pleased, and Romish partialities threatened no schism in the national church. Very few declined attendance upon the worship established by law, in spite of a preference for the papal communion which prevailed extensively in the country. This all but universal conformity continued during the queen's first five years. Within that period, most of the individuals, who formed eventually a Romish party, and introduced a large proportion of Romish families among the aristocracy of England, worshipped in public with their fellow-parishioners. The small number of habitual absentees from church was chiefly made up of deprived clergymen.¹ Yet many of these conformists occasionally attended mass in private, and cherished a rooted predilection for Romanism. It was obvious, however, that such preference must gradually wear away under the ordinary course of mortality, with other accidents, the regular attendance upon a different service, and the gradual operation of protestant succession. Hence some of the deprived clergy who had fled to the continent, took alarm at this general appearance of defection in their friends at home, naturally

* By Mr. Soames.

¹ Queen Elizabeth's *Instructions to Walsingham*, ambassador in France, in 1570.

Camden's *Elizabeth*, in Kennett's, *Hist. Engl.* ii. 428. Bp. Andrewes's *Tortura Torti*. Lond. 1699, p. 130.

considering it as likely to stop all tendency to a reaction in favour of popery, and thus doom them to hopeless exile. They exerted themselves accordingly, to obtain from the council of Trent a formal condemnation of conformity to protestant worship in those who preferred the Romish. Some of the divines assembled at Trent supplied the desired condemnation, in 1562, and this being carefully spread in England, kept many away from church after Elizabeth's first five years. The great majority, however, of those who retained Romish prejudices, continued an outward profession of protestantism, during another five years. A rebellion, fomented by the pope, then broke out in the northern counties; in the following year, a Romish fanatic, named Felton, perhaps insane, posted the pontiff's infamous bull, that pretended to dethrone the queen, upon the gates of the bishop of London's palace;¹ and political exasperation was fast rising in many influential quarters, to an ungovernable height. Elizabeth had transferred the royal confidence from those ancient and wealthy families which possessed it under Mary, to another class of persons, among whom was great ability, but nothing more than very moderate advantages of birth and fortune. For a season, the parties, fallen into political insignificance, were tolerably quiescent, but under a sufficient impulse from without, their irritation and impatience readily exploded. Henceforth England had a Romish sect and party. The members of it were known as *Recusants*, from a *refusal* of conformity to the established religion. This *refusal* was made penal, before the term *Recusant* came into use, and to the penalty, modern Romish writers would fain assign the general conformity of their party, during Elizabeth's first ten years.² But the penalty of absence then was only one shilling for every Sunday, or holiday, upon which it might have occurred; a fine too trifling to be much considered in superior life. In the queen's twenty-third year, this penalty was augmented by a fine of twenty pounds a month, recoverable from all the Recusants over sixteen. This proved, however, wholly powerless to suppress the Romish religion. Opulent families, indeed, paid regular compositions for the liberty of absence from church. This obstinacy of Romish prejudice, at a time when it was highly penal, viewed in conjunction with its apparent insignificance at a time when it incurred a far lower degree of legal harm, plainly marks its ultimate importance as largely created by political exasperation. Had not a violent Romish party arisen under Elizabeth, there seems no reason to believe that England would now contain a native Romish sect.

¹ This bull was issued by Pius V., and is dated, April 25, 1570. Felton affixed it to the gates of London house, on the following second of June, Corpus Christi day. For this offence he was hanged, drawn, and quartered, as a traitor, Aug. 2. The pope's bull was generally disapproved among Romish families in England. Many naturally viewed it as essentially irreligious and indecent: more considered it as a needless provocation to the government, and an un-

feeling compromise of their own safety. It was promptly answered by Bp. Jewel, in some discourses from the pulpit, afterwards published with this title, *A View of a seditious Bull sent into England by Pius V. bishop of Rome; delivered in certain Sermons in the Cathedral Church of Sarum.* Another attack upon it was made by Barlow, who died bishop of Lincoln, in 1613, in a work entitled, *Brutum Fulmen.*

² Butler's *Historical Memoirs*, i. 171.

§ 2. Besides this increased severity against absence from church, which was earned by the northern rebellion in 1569, and the political movements following it, the parliament of 1571 made it high treason to procure, or import, papal bulls pretending to abrogate allegiance to the queen, and also to give or receive absolution by virtue of such bulls. To conceal them for more than six weeks, was made misprision of treason. To import *Agnus Dei's*, or any other similar superstitious toys, from the pope, was made visitable by the penalties of a *Præmunire*, that is, the offending party was liable to be placed without the royal protection. Romish baubles, however intrinsically contemptible, were fairly treated as badges of dependence upon that foreign power which had lately filled the north with commotion, and was known to be still threatening the national tranquillity. In 1581, the parliament treated Romanism with still greater severity. Not only did it make that excessive augmentation, already mentioned, to the penalty for absence from church, but also it made such as reconciled individuals to the church of Rome, liable to the penalties of high treason, and such as received reconciliation, to those of misprision of treason. Saying mass was to be punished with a fine of 200 marks, and one year's imprisonment, hearing it with half the fine, but with the same term of imprisonment. In 1584, an act was passed, rendering all native Jesuits, and seminary priests, found in England after the lapse of forty days, liable to the penalties of high treason: to aid or receive such persons was made felony. Other clauses rendered it highly penal to remain in any one of the *seminaries*, or to enter in any one of them for the future, or to send remittances to them. These acts have been generally condemned by posterity, as shamefully intolerant, and needlessly severe. Among contemporaries, however, there were no liberal views of toleration, and no great difference of opinion as to the necessity of these persecuting statutes. Not only did the whole protestant body consider them needful, and intrinsically desirable, but also many of the more moderate Romanists admitted them to have been earned by the political misconduct of their party.¹ The papal conspiracies against Elizabeth's life and government were too notorious for total denial in any quarter. In all the latter years of her reign, there was, indeed, a general determination among Romanists to treat the sufferers for their faith as martyred bearers of a commission purely religious. But it is observable that these unfortunate individuals

¹ See Watson's *Important Considerations*, and *Quodlibets*, especially the former, which has been several times reprinted, very recently so by Mr. Mendham. The author was a Romish priest, who engaged with Raleigh, and others, in a senseless plot to place Lady Arabella Stuart on the throne, soon after James the First's accession. For this offence he was executed at Winchester towards the close of 1603. His publications, which have wounded Roman-

ism so severely, were probably wrung from him by that jealousy of the Jesuits, common among the secular priests after Loyola's order obtained a firm, and rather an encroaching hold over the Romish families. But this origin of his disclosures, even if it be the true one, detracts nothing from the value of testimony, confirmed abundantly elsewhere, and intrinsically probable. Such, however, is the nature of that in Watson's publications.

appear to have had universally the option of redeeming their lives by a manly disavowal of the deposing doctrines maintained in papal bulls. The government, therefore, and protestants generally, were justified in concluding that in such as would not disavow, treason was inseparably linked with religion.

§ 3. The points from which these Romish emissaries came, were known as the *seminaries*, and the parties themselves were not uncommonly designated by the same word, it being a sort of abbreviation for *seminary priests*. The first establishment which supplied them was conveniently placed at Douay, in 1568. It arose by means of William Allen, of gentlemanly origin in the north of England, who relinquished the principalship of St. Mary's Hall, in Oxford, soon after Elizabeth's accession, and went over to Louvain. Returning into his native country within a short time, he was shocked to see the general attendance at church of such as avowed Romish predilections. He argued so warmly against this conformity, that some of those who practised it, and yet owned papal opinions as their genuine conviction, were offended. Those who had really become protestants were necessarily disgusted, and it is said, that Allen had reason to fear some molestation, from the government, when he went abroad again. A man of his penetration could be at no loss to see, that Romish partialities must soon wear out in England, under the general conformity that he had witnessed. He exerted himself, accordingly, to form the establishment at Douay.¹ There, English fugitives could find, at least, a temporary shelter, plans for keeping Romanism alive in the country could be matured, and young people could be educated expressly for maintaining or spreading papal principles. At first, Elizabeth and her council looked upon the establishment with contempt;² but in this they did not show their usual sagacity. The Douay experiment was most successful. In spite of the risk that attended its youth, on revisiting in disguise their native land, a succession of such young persons was found, who took an oath to return into England, and labour there for the Romish faith.³ The intrepid fulfilment of this obligation stained Elizabeth's government with the blood of many victims, whose noble self-devotion has ever since been a fruitful theme for Romish exultation. Nor is this unsubstantial. At the same time, it should be recollected, that the seminary priests, and other clerical victims

¹ Allen was made cardinal in 1587, and archbishop of Mechlin in 1589. He died in 1594, aged 62. He was latterly known as the *Cardinal of England*, and really exercised a sort of paramount authority over the interests of English Romanism, during many years. He had numerous valuable qualities, and maintained an appearance strictly professional, until 1588, when the coming *Armada* brought him forward as author of *An Admonition to the Nobility and People of England and Ireland*, one of the most violent and offensive of

political libels. It had hardly appeared before the *Armada* was no more, and infinite pains were taken to suppress it. The piece is so unlike anything of Allen's, that it has been often attributed to Persons, and probably that coarse Jesuit might be more or less its author; but Allen consented to have it pass for his, and must consequently bear the burden of its infamy.

² Sanders, *De Schism. Angl.* 312.

³ The oath may be seen in English, in Fuller's *Church History*, p. 92, and in Latin, in Moore's *Hist. Miss. Angl. Soc. Jesu*, 58.

of Elizabeth's anti-papal legislation, were in reality professional adventurers, who reckoned, for many years, upon some accident or revolution, to place Mary queen of Scots upon the throne, and requite them with preferment in the re-established papal church. Their case was really analogous to that of those who seek advancement in the military profession, or any other calling known to involve personal risk. Nor did calculation upon political movements in favour of Romanism cease with the Scottish Mary's tragical death. Absurd schemes were then set on foot for forcing the royal family of Spain upon England,¹ and thus the self-devotion of papal agents was never free from a political alloy. This will account for the liberal support given to the foreign seminaries, both by continental princes, and by the discontented Romish party in England. Alien enemies could see no line of policy more likely to embarrass, if not overthrow Elizabeth, than to open houses of refuge for her discontented subjects, and to send a large proportion of them back again, expressly trained for the continuance of a religion that the laws forbade. Hence Douay did not long remain the only seat of an English *seminary*. Ten other such establishments were eventually formed.² It would be unjust, however, to name politics alone in speaking of the support given to the *seminaries*. There can be no doubt that religious considerations operated in their favour, both among foreign and domestic supporters; especially among the latter. These establishments were largely benefited by clandestine remittances from England, and many such must have unquestionably come from parties who acted under a conscientious sense of obligation to support what they thought the catholic religion. But even these English remittances were not free from that alloy of baser motives which lowers the great bulk of men's better actions. Many of the English families, that eventually fell into a Romish sect and party, had been enriched by monastic pillage, and felt no disposition whatever to relinquish this augmentation to their fortunes. Such parties quieted their own consciences, and sought papal acquiescence under their forbidden gains, by sending contributions from them to the continental seminaries.³

§ 4. Allen's Douay *Seminary* was intended for secular priests, as Romanists term ordinary clergymen, and so were some other of those foreign institutions. Others were for Jesuits, and these furnished, in the end, the most effective props of the Romish sect and party in England. The first Jesuits that came thither were two Spaniards, but their stay was very brief, ignorance of the language rendering them useless. Afterwards came over an Englishman, Jasper Heywood, but his arrival produced nothing remarkable.

¹ This plan was not only agitated privately among individuals, but even advocated in a pamphlet published by Persons under the name of *Doleman*, and written by himself with others.

² *Viz.* at Rome, Paris, Madrid, Lisbon,

Valladolid, Seville, Louvain, Ghent, Liege, and St. Omer's. Some of these *Seminaries* were not founded until the following century.

³ Fuller's *Church History*, 92.

Thirdly, in the spring of 1580, came over Robert Persons, and Edmund Campion, both Oxford men, who had once professed protestantism, but abandoned it and became Jesuits. They were regularly sent from Rome under instructions from the general of their order, at the pope's expense, and with his cordial approbation, to do what they could for the papal church in their native country. Both were men of considerable abilities and acquirements; but in manners they differed, Campion being gentle-tempered, Persons rugged. Their mission was no sooner known to Elizabeth's government, than it made strenuous exertions to have them apprehended immediately upon landing. These, however, proved ineffectual, and both the celebrated Jesuits remained undiscovered for many months, which were judiciously improved in giving consistency to the rising Romish sect and party. At length, Campion was taken, and towards the close of 1581, he suffered death, at Tyburn, under a conviction for high treason. Being an accomplished man, of pleasing manners, and unblemished morals, his cruel fate has ever attracted great commiseration. But he seems really to have come under the lash of a law, passed so long back as the reign of Edward III., called ordinarily *the statute of treasons*; and after his trial, a document entrusted to him and his co-adjutor was discovered, which aggravates the case against him. This was a bull, represented as a mitigation of the deposing bull which pretended to deprive Elizabeth, and allowing Romanists to obey her *as matters stood*, but mentioning also the possibility of executing the deposing bull, at some future time.¹ Thus these Jesuitic emissaries were, in fact, to proclaim papal acquiescence in a provisional allegiance of the Romish body, until a feasible opportunity should arrive for its open assumption of a hostile character. Persons, the other bearer of this treacherous document, eluded pursuit, and made his escape to the continent, where he spent many years of active exertion to keep alive a spirit of political speculation in the English Romanists, and to discredit the protestant establishment. The opening made by him and his unfortunate friend, Campion, could never afterwards be closed. Henceforth, England was visited by a succession of Jesuits, who proved the most effective of papal missionaries, and to their labours, probably, English Romanism principally owed its preservation.

§ 5. Its first appearance in the ranks of English nonconformity, seems to have originated in principles which ever denounced it with the most fierce and intolerant hostility. Most of the English Protestants whom Mary's persecution drove abroad, returned with violent

¹ 'Petatur a summo Domino nostro explicatio bullæ declaratoriæ contra Elizabetham et ei adhærentes, quam Catholici cupiunt intelligi hoc modo, ut obliget semper illam et hæreticos, Catholicos vero nullo modo obliget, *rebus sic stantibus*, sed tum demum quando publica ejusdem bullæ executio fieri poterit.' This treacherous *explication* was granted by the pope to Persons and Campion, on the 14th

of April, 1580. (*Execution of Justice*, attributed to Lord Burghley, p. 19.) The principal Romish authorities for the history of English Jesuitism, are Bartoli and Moore. The former's work, printed at Rome in 1667, is entitled *Dell' Istoria della Compagnia di Gesu, L'Inghilterra*. Moore's work, printed in 1660, and entitled *Historia Missionis Anglicanæ Soc. Jesu*, is extremely scarce.

partialities for those democratic forms of religious discipline, which they had seen among the republicans who gave them shelter. Thus while Englishmen with Romish predilections were attending church, and seemed likely to glide imperceptibly into sincere protestants, many of their countrymen who were really so, loudly complained of much in the protestant establishment. Against its religious principles, they had nothing to allege, but its exterior was denounced as popish and anti-christian; not absolutely sinful in itself, but inexpedient; and instead of edifying, rather the reverse. Vainly did those who felt some attachment to these reprobated externals, or thought them desirable to conciliate Romish prejudice, argue for their continuance upon this latter ground. The plea may seem reasonable, but protestant opponents spurned it as an unworthy and pernicious compromise, which disgraced sound principles, and endangered souls. Acute Romanists quickly availed themselves of this controversy. They might fairly represent it as an indication of a spirit in protestantism, which would strip the conformist of every religious external to which he had been used, however harmless, and stop at nothing short of his surrender upon the most abject and unconditional terms. They generally did represent it as a proof that religious peace was only attainable in the papal communion; every other inviting interminable discord and mutability. Upon minds predisposed for such arguments, they operated with great success, and Romish prejudice was every day revived or strengthened, by the augmenting violence of protestant dissension. Artfully to widen this was even thought advisable. Two preachers of reformed opinions pushed to an extreme, were actually apprehended: from one of whom accidentally dropped instructions from a Jesuit; the other was a Dominican friar.¹

§ 6. The controversy, however, which early took such a threatening appearance, turned for some years upon mere externals. In ordinary, clergymen had usually worn a square cap, and a dress otherwise conformable to the regulations of an university. In their ministrations, they had worn a surplice. None pretended, that there was anything sinful, or even absolutely unsuitable, in such habiliments. On the contrary, it was thought becoming in all quarters, that ministers of the gospel should be distinguished, both when officiating and abroad, from other men. But everything connected with religion, it was maintained, ought to have an edifying tendency: the surplice and corner cap had the reverse, having served the cause of idolatry, and become ‘the defiled robes of anti-Christ,’ by their use in the church of Rome.² Many of the reformed clergy refused, accordingly, to wear either of them. Some of these were seen abroad in round caps; others wore hats. Among such persons, none, probably, ministered in the surplice; and besides using this discretion, many took the liberty of using common basons, instead

¹ Collier, ii. 518. Strype's *Parker*, i. 485.

² Whittingham, dean of Durham, to the Earl of Leicester. Strype's *Parker*, iii. 76.

of fonts, in baptizing; of administering the communion to those who sat, or stood; and of making other slight inroads upon prescribed forms, or established usage.¹ Conformists with anything of Romish prepossessions were naturally disgusted by this licence, and in 1564, the government made a formal call upon the prelacy to suppress all such irregularities.² Various attempts were made for this purpose, with more or less of cordiality, (the prelates commonly being rather inclined for connivance,) but Elizabeth was firm, and insisted upon strict obedience to the law. The dissentients, however, were equally firm in their determination to evade, or defy it. Endeavours to enforce it naturally produced several cases of individual suffering, and thus exasperation rendered the breach, every day, wider and more incurable. At length, in 1567, many of the dissentients would frequent no longer the churches of conforming clergymen, although none made objection to the doctrine preached there. As they would not, however, forego social worship, they secretly met for that purpose; and a party so engaged in the city of London was surprised and dispersed by the magistracy, several individuals present being taken into custody.³ From this interference nothing was gained. In 1564, members of the anti-vestural party had become popularly known as *Puritans* or *Precisians*.⁴ Many of the more zealous among them now deliberated upon the lawfulness of a formal separation, and made up their minds to form secret congregations of their own, treating conformity as a positive sin. The bulk, indeed, both clerical and lay, of those who were possessed by puritanical scruples, continued in communion with the establishment, only evading or defying its obligations, and striving, as much as could be done with any degree of prudence, to overthrow them. But others, with whom they cordially agreed in everything but in admitting the lawfulness of an evasive conformity, were all the while bent upon organising an impregnable opposition to every religious usage not seen at Geneva. To their party, the half-conformists were perpetually supplying fresh recruits. Thus the year 1567 gave birth to a regular schism among English Protestants. Henceforth many of them have ever separated from the episcopal church, and continued under various forms that spirit of Dissent, which was originally provoked by nothing more important than vestures, and a few ceremonies.

§ 7. The seeming disproportion between cause and effect in this instance, has often brought censure upon Elizabeth's government; an obstinate schism, it is thought, having been really provoked by the mere want of judicious concession.⁵ But this view leaves out of sight the large proportion of Englishmen who retained Romish

¹ Cecil MS. Strype's *Parker*, i. 302. The paper is dated Feb. 14, 1564.

² By a letter from the queen to the archbishop of Canterbury, dated Jan. 25, 1564. It may be seen in Strype's *Parker*, iii. 65. The report of irregularities, referred to in the last note, might have been made in consequence of this letter.

³ Strype's *Parker*, i. 481.

⁴ Fuller's *Ch. Hist.* 76.

⁵ "Had the use of habits and a few ceremonies been left discretionary, both ministers and people had been easy; but it was the compelling these things by law, as they told the archbishop, that made them separate." Neal, *Hist. Pur.* Lond. 1837, i. 163.

partialities, and were, consequently, unwilling to see any sweeping curtailment of ancient religious usages. Many confirmed Protestants too, especially such as had not gone abroad under Mary, desired nothing more than a restoration of King Edward's system. Others, again, would have had England formally become a Lutheran country. The concession to the anti-vestural party of points now generally considered so trifling, would really, therefore, have been the sacrifice of a large and peaceable majority, to a narrow but clamorous minority. As a mere politician, Elizabeth might well consider it undesirable, no less than inequitable, to venture upon such an experiment. But moreover she soon must have seen reason to believe that the concessions which had been so clamorously demanded, would have proved wholly unavailing to stay the strife. About the year 1571, the anti-vesturists brought forward new claims, upon which they insisted with all their former vehemence. Calvin had organised at Geneva a democratic system of ecclesiastical discipline, and this was now to be forced upon England as necessary to secure evangelical doctrine, privileges, and practice, in their full integrity. The hierarchy was to be superseded by local consistories, partly clerical, partly lay, dependent upon general boards, similarly constituted. Cathedrals, with their several dignitaries and officers, were to be abolished; ecclesiastical patronage was to pass from the crown and individuals, into the hands of parishioners. These latter were to be placed under the moral inspection of ruling elders acting conjointly with the pastor, and the whole country was, in fact, to become the theatre of a well-organised, intolerant, despotic religious democracy. *Discipline* was the war-cry under which the zealous champions of this new polity fought, and their system has been called *Disciplinarian Puritanism*. They struggled violently for its establishment, during more than twenty years, sometimes convulsing the whole frame of society, and occasioning severe hardships to such individuals as fell under the lash of the law. Upon the cases of these unfortunate men, much has been rather invidiously said; but really they had no great cause of complaint. Legal proceedings against clergymen who defied, or evaded the conditions on which they took preferment, might become, at times, absolutely necessary, and never could have been censurable in themselves, however they might occasionally assume a merciless tinge from the stern character of the age. Nor are the strifes that agitated all England, and the distresses that overtook some of the disciplinarian clergy, fairly chargeable upon the refusal of vestural relief. Had it been thought reasonable and practicable to afford this, conformity with Geneva would still have been incomplete. Clergymen who looked for models there, would have never ceased to long for opportunities to gain livings by popular suffrage, and for exemption from episcopal superiority. Laymen, who thought themselves likely to become ruling elders, or who were smitten with an itch for interference, or even actuated by religious austerity, would have been certain to plead the authority that expelled the vestures, for the establishment of

elective boards to keep the clergy in check, and to hold an inquisition upon the conduct of everyone within the parish. The vestures and ceremonies, indeed, which gave the first occasion to puritanism, were always treated as essentially unimportant, and only rendered otherwise by their accidental abuse to the purposes of Romish superstition. The *holy Discipline*, however, as the new polity was called, was represented as undoubtedly revealed in the New Testament: at once, therefore, a privilege to which every Christian was entitled, and a control which he was bound to undergo.¹

§ 8. The lead in English struggles for the establishment of disciplinarian puritanism, was taken by Thomas Cartwright, a fellow of Trinity college, Cambridge, born in Hertfordshire, in 1535. Having deservedly obtained a high reputation in the university, he went abroad, and in a residence at Geneva, became a zealous convert to Calvin's system in all its parts. He took from home an antipathy to cap and surplice, but he returned fully bent upon preaching the much vaunted *holy Discipline* to his countrymen. A large party at Cambridge readily became captivated by his eloquence, and he was elected Margaret professor of divinity. In that situation, he lectured against the hierarchy, and against the established principles of admission to ministerial cures. For such charges, his doctrine was, that men were to be sought by others, and to have a minister put upon them without a call from the people was tyranny.² Attacks of this kind from a public professor, upon established institutions, were obviously insufferable. The university authorities were therefore driven into severity. Cartwright was first ejected from his fellowship. To this forfeiture he had laid himself open by his refusal to take priest's orders, as he was bound by the college statutes. He would not even lay claim to deacon's orders, which he had really taken, but seems to have destroyed the letters then given to him. His right to preach he referred wholly to a call made upon him when abroad. After the loss of his fellowship, he was deprived of his professorship, denied a doctor's degree, forbidden to preach within the vice-chancellor's jurisdiction, and expelled the university. He then withdrew again to the continent, and remained there until all England rang with disciplinarian polemics. In these he took the foremost ground, his principal adversary being Whitgift, whom he left master of his own college in Cambridge, and who became afterwards archbishop of Canterbury. Probably, his own temper would not allow him to rest contentedly as a champion, however popular, in a mere paper war. Certainly his position as the oracle of the puritanical party would not allow it. Hence orders were twice given for his arrest. Once, he escaped; the second time, he was taken into custody. The government, however, was evidently anxious to leave him alone as much as possible. His friend, the Earl of

¹ Those who wish to investigate the disciplinarian question should consult Whitgift's controversy with Cartwright, and Bancroft's *Survey of the holy Discipline*.

² Cartwright's own account of his principles, given when deprived of his professorship, may be seen in Strype's *Whitgift*, iii. 20.

Leicester, founded an hospital at Warwick, and made him master of it, adding a handsome pension to the stipend. In this situation, Cartwright spent all his latter years, easy in his circumstances, and allowed to occupy the pulpit of his house. As he mellowed by age, his powerful and religious mind could not overlook the happiness of such a situation, or the good qualities of those who might have formerly opposed him. It was believed, accordingly, that he felt considerable regret for the intemperance of his early years, and he certainly did justice to his old antagonist, Whitgift.¹ He died in 1602, generally respected for his learning, ability, and moral worth, but by no means possessed of that public importance which had signalised all his middle age.

§ 9. The decline of his influence did not arise alone from the effects of time upon his own constitutional warmth and rashness. About the year 1580, a competitor for sectarian popularity came forward in Robert Browne, son of a Rutlandshire gentleman. He received his academical education at Cambridge, it is thought at Corpus Christi college, and first adopted Puritanical opinions. These, however, he soon partially abandoned for a new system framed by himself. The Puritans would have continued the church-establishment, if they could only regulate it in their own way. Browne, and his party, would hear of nothing but its destruction, denouncing it as essentially antichristian. They were equally opposed to the Puritanical views of discipline. Every congregation, according to them, was a church of itself, and entitled to the full regulation of its own affairs. In doctrine, they did not, indeed, differ from the church and the Puritans. Their principles eventually passed under the name of *Independency*, and are such as have long been professed by the great majority of English Protestant Dissenters. Browne himself exhibited no great attachment to them, or, indeed, valuable qualities of any kind. In spite of his fervid harangues against the church, he did not eventually scruple to eat her bread, but accepted of a benefice in Northamptonshire, upon which he lived to the end of his life. He died in 1630, in gaol, having been committed for an assault upon the village constable, who came to him for a rate. By way, perhaps, of keeping up some appearance of consistency, he never preached: an abstinence from the duties which he was paid for performing, that really made his case worse: whatever pride might whisper to the contrary.² Seldom have the foundations of a mighty party been laid by one more personally contemptible.

§ 10. The leader's unimportant character naturally had an unfavourable effect upon the early progress of his party, and in 1592, even the sagacious mind of Bacon viewed it as utterly beneath notice, and in fact nearly extinct.³ It was, however, too deeply rooted in the feelings which extensively prevail, for this rapid disappearance. Other leaders, indeed, had actually then secured its vigorous revival,

¹ Paule's *Life of Whitgift*, 72.

² Fuller's *Ch. Hist.* 168.

³ *Observations on a Libel.* Works, iii. 60.

and in 1593, Brownism again attracted general observation. Its new apostles were a clergyman, named Greenwood, and a layman, who had studied the law, named Barrow. The latter appears to have been the more able and active of the two,¹ and from him Browne's revived opinions retained the name of *Barrowism*. Their progress gave violent offence to the Puritans, whose stronghold, the House of Commons, passed an act in 1593, placing Protestant Recusants in a worse condition than Romish.² This was levelled at the Barrowists. Their principles were, however, those which defy penal statutes, as the next century bore ample witness, and as the final triumph of Independency over Presbyterianism has triumphantly proved.

§ 11. In aid of these attacks of rival Protestant non-conformity upon the Calvinistic *discipline*, came the gradual decline of public interest in the question. During the last twelve or fourteen years of Elizabeth's reign, the old Puritan party lost much of its former hold upon the country.³ All its positions had been narrowly sifted by able opponents, many of its warmest advocates were dead, others had become much more moderate. Under this calm, man's inherent appetite for theological questions took a new direction. Hitherto, Calvin had governed the doctrinal belief of both the Puritans and the church-party. His *Institutes* especially were a theological manual of such intrinsic importance, that, coming as they did from a Protestant author, all Elizabeth's subjects dissenting from Rome gladly used them as their guide. But Calvin's authority upon discipline having fallen into a much less advantageous position than it long occupied, his doctrinal authority was not slow in suffering under the same re-action. Many scholars began to canvass those assertions of irrelative decrees, which have rendered the great reformer of Geneva so famous. His English friends were disgusted and alarmed at this unwonted boldness. But they looked in vain to the Thirty-nine Articles for means of suppressing it. Whatever might be assumed as to the opinions and intentions of those who framed, and of those who remodelled that national test, it evidently could be taken by such as rejected all extreme views upon the doctrine of predestination. The advocates of such views being numerous and influential, drew up in the autumn of 1595, at the house and under the sanction of Whitgift, the primate, the celebrated Lambeth Articles.⁴ Elizabeth was

¹ Bancroft's *Survey of the pretended holy Discipline*, 300.

² Neal's *Review of the principal Facts objected to in the first vol. of the Hist. Pur.* 63.

³ G. Cranmer to R. Hooker. *Walton's Lives*, 187.

⁴ The Lambeth Articles, are '1. God, from eternity, hath predestinated certain men unto life, certain men he hath reprobated. 2. The moving, or efficient cause of predestination unto life, is not the foresight of faith, or of perseverance, or of good works, or of anything that is in the person pre-

destinated, but only the good will and pleasure of God. 3. There is pre-determined a certain number of the predestinate, which can neither be augmented nor diminished. 4. Those who are not predestinated to salvation, shall necessarily be damned for their sins. 5. A true, living, and justifying faith, and the spirit of God justifying, is not extinguished, falleth not away, it vanisheth not away in the elect, either finally or totally. 6. A man truly faithful, that is, such a one who is endued with a justifying faith, is certain, with a full assurance of faith, of the remission of his sins, and of

displeased at this unauthorised attempt to narrow the terms of national conformity by the preparation of new tests likely to be warmly and extensively controverted. Nor does the primate himself seem to have gone all lengths with the party to which he lent his house and authority. Had it been otherwise, he hardly could have patronised Hooker, a learned and influential holder of those moderate predestinarian opinions, which the Lambeth committee was anxious to suppress. Henceforth, the puritanical party assumed a new appearance. It still insisted upon the *Discipline*, but doctrine also came now into the dispute. Most of the old enemies to the church-establishment adopted the Lambeth Articles, at least tacitly, and have been called *Doctrinal Puritans*. A large portion of their opponents sided with Hooker, and other objectors to extreme opinions. This party eventually produced all the brightest stars of English theology, and has ever numbered among its adherents a great majority of the clergy.

§ 12. Another distinctive point, when doctriual separation began, was afforded by the Lord's day, or Sunday. The strictness with which this day had been ordinarily kept in western Europe, during the earlier years of her conversion, had much relaxed under the gradual operation of time, and the competition of numerous festivals. It might seem unreasonable to insist upon the same degree of strictness in keeping these, that was justly claimed for a day which could establish a sacred character from the Decalogue. If men would give up some part of them to religion, they might fairly employ the rest in innocent recreation. Sunday, however, sank to the same level. It became rather a day of amusement than of devotion. The first reformers paid no marked attention to this abuse. But as Puritanism gained ground, it brought under general notice the propriety of greater strictness in the observation of Sunday. The holy day was, indeed, no longer called by its ancient name, or by that of the Lord's day, as it had been in all preceding ages of the Christian era. It came to be known as the *Sabbath*, a designation hitherto denoting Saturday. In 1595, the notions long current in puritanical circles upon the subject, were embodied in a publication from the pen of Dr. Bound, entitled a *Treatise of the Sabbath*. This gave the signal for inculcating the severest views upon the hallowing of Sunday; which, it was maintained, Christians were bound to keep, with at least as much rigour as any Jews had kept the Mosaic Sabbath. Unhappily, the church-party merely looked upon this question as a new turn in the aggressive tactics of their old enemy. Puritanism, it was argued, had set up its sabbath for no other reason than to decry the few festivals which the reformation had spared.¹ That an antipathy to these was

his everlasting salvation by Christ. 7. Saving grace is not given, is not granted, is not communicated to all men, by which they may be saved, if they will. 8. No man can come unto Christ unless it shall be given him, and unless the Father shall draw him; and all men are not drawn by the

Father, that they may come to the Son. 9. It is not in the will or power of every one to be saved.' Fuller's *Ch. Hist.* b. 9, p. 230.

¹ Heylin's *History of the Presbyterians*, 340.

greatly connected with puritanical movements in the sabbatarian controversy, is unquestionable: it might even have first suggested them. But it is obvious that a greater strictness in keeping Sunday, than had hitherto prevailed in England, and than now prevails in continental Europe, was highly desirable. Nor are Englishmen without considerable obligations to puritanism for establishing such strictness as a national peculiarity. In opposing the first approaches to it, the church-party took a false step, which injured its hold upon serious minds, and which those who venerate its character must regret. Had it taken a safe and dignified position, when sabbatarian notions became popular, it would have partially come over to them; merely seeking to mitigate their extravagance and rigour. Instead of this judicious course, the church-party vented angry pamphlets, advocated questionable appropriations of Sunday leisure, and strove to vanquish opposition by the arm of power. Seldom has that party, which has done England so many invaluable services, appeared in a light equally disadvantageous.

§ 13. Against the tide of innovation, from whatever quarter it set in, Elizabeth invariably stood firm. She did, indeed, frequently stoop to temporise, and thus unintentionally encourage expectations that sometimes recoiled fearfully upon the heads of individuals. But when it really came to either the surrender or the maintenance of established principles, she adhered to the latter part of the alternative. Enemies to the church of England have usually accounted for this tenacity, by considering the queen, either as indifferent to religion altogether, or possessed by such a fondness for the showy ritual of Romanism, that she clung to as much of it as the people were at all likely to endure. She did, indeed, retain a cross in her chapel rather pertinaciously in the beginning of her reign: she approved also a stately prelacy, and clerical celibacy. But such facts are no solid ground for doubting her protestant convictions. These were matured under the discreet and scholarly guidance of Archbishop Parker, whose principle was resistance to the uncatholic pretensions both of Rome and Geneva. While his royal mistress, accordingly, opposed puritanism, she really showed no partiality for popery. She might view a bald simplicity in public worship as impolitic, or find it disagreeable; she might wish to preserve various dignities well endowed, as means of securing a learned clergy, and one that could mix in superior life; she might share in current prejudices against sacerdotal marriage, and even entertain some personal weakness upon that question: but still, she might have no leaning towards those articles of belief which distinguish the church of Rome.

§ 14. Her ministers, generally, were more or less favourable to puritanism, as were her two personal favourites, Leicester and Essex. For this, cupidity has been commonly assigned as the principal reason. The fortunes reared within memory from monastic pillage naturally inflamed men who possessed power, but no considerable wealth. Nor were estates of late wholly indebted for augmentation

to the convents. By exchanges, or other means, a large portion of property that had endowed the prelacy and dignified clergy, was now merged among private inheritances. At the outset of Elizabeth's reign, further facilities were given for these tempting operations by an act authorising the queen, on the avoidance of a bishopric, to make exchanges of its lands for impropriate tithes. Puritanism would have set all this property free, by sweeping away bishops and cathedrals, as useless and pernicious. It is true, that the Puritans often imitated Romanists, in representing all property, once given to pious uses, as inalienably devoted to such purposes. Hence it was not uncommon to hear that even monastic wealth must be reclaimed. It was wanted, some said, for the due establishment of ruling elders, and other purposes prescribed by the *holy Discipline*.¹ At other times, however, a puritanical friend, high in office, but deficient in fortune, could be flattered with hopes of a suitable provision out of the episcopal and capitular lands.² Ministers of state, and court minions, could not doubt that the latter arrangement would prevail, if the superior clergy could be reduced to ruin. They saw even Romish families tenacious of monastic plunder, and successful in obtaining acquiescence, if not approval, from Rome herself. They saw the Scottish nobility greatly enriched by property gained irregularly from the church, while the men who preached them into wealth were pining in poverty. Elizabeth's ministers and favourites may, therefore, fairly be thought far from disinterested in the encouragement or connivance that they gave to puritanism.

§ 15. In the see of Canterbury was, however, generally found a sufficient counterpoise to this insidious influence. It is true, that a spirit of conciliation and seeming compromise, was occasionally pushed to an extent which encouraged the opposition that it was meant to disarm or extinguish. But upon the whole, the resolution taken, on Elizabeth's accession, to maintain ecclesiastical affairs as her brother had left them, was never abandoned. There can be no reasonable doubt, that Archbishop Parker was, so long as he lived, the mainstay of this consistent policy. Contemporary Puritans thought so, and loaded him with obloquy; which has largely affected his memory among Dissenters, down to the present day. It was a happy circumstance for those who value the catholic exterior adopted by the church of England, that Parker did not emigrate in the Marian times. His understanding was, indeed, of that solid, cautious kind, his habits were so patiently laborious, and his tastes were so decidedly guided by prescription and antiquity, that he was less likely than most men to be turned aside from the principles which he had seen established under Edward. Still, he might not have been entirely proof against the lengthened conversation and example of men who had obliged him in a time of need, and whose opinions generally

¹ This was maintained in a petition to parliament, in 1585. Bancroft's *Sermon at Paule's Crosse*. Lond. 1588, p. 25.

² Sutcliffe's *Answers to certaine calumnious petitions, articles, and questions of the Consistorian Faction*. Lond. 1592, p. 85.

coincided with his own. He had, however, no such temptation, and all the years of his primacy were devoted, in spite of numerous hindrances and discouragements, to the preservation of that strict connexion with catholic antiquity which places the church of England upon so much higher ground than can be maintained by religious communities unable originally to command episcopal succession, or since inconsiderately carried forward by the stream of innovation.

§ 16. Parker was succeeded by Edmund Grindal, a virtuous and amiable man, who had occupied successively before the sees of London and York. Under Mary he had been among the exiles, and he brought home that indiscriminate abhorrence of popery which led so many of his contemporaries into puritanism. Finding that his objections to vestures and other trifles were likely to keep him out of any situation that would give him extensive means of usefulness, he did not think himself at liberty to decline preferment upon such grounds, and he conformed. He was, however, always very tender of puritanical scruples, and, by those who entertained them, he was generally regarded as of their party. As archbishop of Canterbury, he was reduced to insignificance. A practice, known as *prophesying*, had been encouraged by himself and others of the prelacy. It was an assembly for the purpose of expounding and discussing Scripture. Many people, without any party views, thought it highly desirable as a means for awakening the faculties and extending the information of a clergy that evidently wanted intellectual culture. But it soon became a party engine. Puritanism eagerly made use of it, and Elizabeth repeatedly demanded its suppression. The resolution to suppress it was finally and effectively taken, during Grindal's primacy, and his refusal to co-operate caused the queen to bring him into the court of Starchamber, which suspended him from his archiepiscopal functions.¹ This suspension was removed before his death, but he never recovered Elizabeth's favour; nor did his primacy act at all upon the ecclesiastical affairs of the day, except in as far as it might have exasperated the Puritans by making him pass for a martyr to their cause.

§ 17. John Whitgift succeeded Grindal, and held the primacy more than twenty difficult years. The queen would have placed him in it before the vacancy was caused by death; age, blindness, and royal displeasure having rendered his venerable predecessor anxious to resign. But Whitgift would not consent. When the course of nature opened Canterbury to him, he undertook the charge, and gained great applause from all who valued the catholic basis on which the Anglican reformation had been settled.² Such as desired to supersede this by the *platform* of Geneva, as their *holy Discipline* was called, naturally hated and vilified their great opponent, the archbishop. From them estimates of his character have been taken ever

¹ In 1578. He was preferred to Canterbury in 1576, and died in 1583.

² Stowe, 835. Sir Henry Wotton, in the

Reliquiæ Wottonianæ, Camden. Keble's *Hooker*, i. 49.

since by Dissenters, and such as have a preference for democracy, or seek support from it. But Whitgift really deserves the respectful remembrance of posterity. He was disinterested, consistent, single-minded, liberal, and discerning, above most men. His great natural blemish was hastiness of temper. This, however, he corrected by a spirit so thoroughly considerate and forgiving, that his friends rather apprehended from him undue lenity.¹ When principle was at stake, he would make no compromise. In secular politics he did not interfere, usually retiring from the council-board, when it was unoccupied by ecclesiastical affairs. To take the lead in these, he brought a firm front of scholarly conviction; and it is most probable, that the queen, who valued him highly to the last, owed much of her steadfastness as a religious ruler, to his well-informed, consistent councils. Those who charge both him and her with criminal intolerance, are bound to consider that liberty of conscience was not a question under notice. The *platformers* contended for the exclusive establishment of their own *discipline*. They always branded the profession of Romanism as a capital crime. In the parliament of 1593, they abused their power to treat Barrowism, or Independency, in a similar manner.² If they could have gained a complete ascendancy, there can be hardly a doubt that violent means would have been unsparingly taken to suppress the church-party. It is unjust, therefore, to blame Elizabeth, and her chief religious adviser, Whitgift, for missing those views of toleration which were the growth of a later age; and it is useless to speculate upon their disposition to oppose a line of policy which the times never called upon them to consider.³

§ 18. Undoubtedly, however, Elizabeth's religious policy is stained with a degree of cruelty that could hardly have been necessary. But the age was cruel, and allowance upon that score is fairly claimable for the memories of all whom it entrusted with power. Ordinary felonies were then treated in England with a severity which now appears horrid and intolerable. The law of treason too was construed so as to take in various offences, with which treason, as ordinarily understood, really has very little concern; and yet, in all cases of conviction under it, the revolting butchery that it prescribes was carried into effect. It was under this law that so many Romish priests were dragged upon scaffolds to undergo a violent death and loathsome mutilation. The queen professed to take no man's life merely on account of his religion. With respect, however, to five

¹ The Earl of Salisbury said after his death, in the Star-chamber, 'that there was nothing more to be feared in his government, especially towards his latter time, than his mildness and clemency.' Paule's *Life of Abp. Whitgift*, Lond. 1699, p. 80.

² Neal fairly designates this as 'one of the severest acts of oppression and cruelty that ever was passed by the representatives of a protestant nation, and a free people.' *Hist. Pur.* i. 346.

³ There is a life of Whitgift, by Sir

George Paule, the comptroller of his household, which is valuable as coming from a contemporary with the best means of information, but is too brief for such an important primacy. The great magazine of materials for considering the archbishop, as especially connected with his times, is Strype's life, which, in the Oxford edition of 1822, fills 3 vols. 8vo. His life of Abp. Parker is of like extent; that of Abp. Grindal is in a single volume. All the three works are of great value.

instances, in which death by fire was inflicted under the old common law against heresy, this profession was manifestly untenable. The wretched sufferers broached opinions condemned by the first four general councils, and were not even charged with any political offence. In the prosecutions of Romish priests, the case was altogether different. The accused were arraigned under the old statute of treasons, and appear to have had universally the option of saving their lives by renouncing the deposing doctrines which have brought inextinguishable infamy upon Rome. The prosecutions too were not instituted against the Marian clergy, but only against importations from the continent, where an active conspiracy, abetted by successive popes, was known to be on foot against the queen's life and government.¹ Nor, again, did these severities against the Romish party begin until Elizabeth had been twelve years upon the throne, and the pope had issued a bull to depose her. It was for posting this disgraceful and mischievous document upon the gates of London house, that a fanatic, who seems to have been rather insane, became the first Elizabethan martyr, according to Romanists, or according to Protestants, suffered as a traitor. Between 1571 and 1581, there were nine similar executions. In subsequent years of the queen's reign, 170 Romanists altogether appear to have died upon the scaffold, the year of the Spanish *Armada* having more of these frightful executions than any other.² In the great majority of these cases, no particulars are known; but there can be no doubt that all the unfortunate parties were treated merely as civil offenders, connected with foreigners in open hostility to the queen, and necessarily so treated from overt acts of their own. Such are the grounds of all known prosecutions instituted against papal emissaries imported from abroad under Elizabeth. Hence there can be no reasonable doubt, that if the whole mass of alleged Romish martyrdoms could be brought under examination, all the sufferers would appear to have been arraigned as amenable to justice from their detection in practices which threatened the queen's life and the national tranquillity. Nor will any sufficient and rational

¹ 'These lawes against which you com-
plaine, drewe not in your priests which
were made in Queene Maries time, though
they were catholique priests, and exercised
their priestly function, and though they had
better meanes to raise a partie in England,
because they were acquainted with the state,
and knew where the seeds of that religion
remained: But in that catholique religion
of which they were priests, they found not
this article of tumult and sedition, and
withdrawing of subjects from their obedi-
ence,' Downe's *Pseudo-martyr*. Lond.
1610, p. 161.

² The number of Romish executions, or
martyrdoms, as the writer calls them, in
1588, the *Armada* year, is stated by him at
36. The next largest number given is 18,
which he assigns to 1591. The writer
might seem to have merely used his initials,

being cited as 'I. W. Priest,' in a tract
from which these particulars are taken, en-
titled *The Fyerie Tryall of God's Saints*,
Lond. 1612. The author of this tract con-
trasts the executions of Protestants upon
charges purely religious, in Mary's short
reign, with the executions of Romanists,
upon charges wholly political, in Elizabeth's
long reign. He does not impugn the accu-
racy of I. W.'s numbers; therefore it is
most probable, that between 1569 and 1604,
180 Romanists really were executed in
England. Dodd makes the number 191,
and Milner, 204. But a contemporary, an-
xious to make the most of his case, is obvi-
ously more worthy of reliance, than partisans
who lived at a long interval afterwards, and
knew it hardly possible to find any certain
evidence of an over-statement.

inquirer be able to deny that Elizabeth's government had indeed urgent call for alarm, precaution, and severity. The utmost that can be said in favour of the Romish party is, that apprehensions of it were overstrained, penalties against it indefensibly cruel. Some allowance, however, is fairly claimable even for excessive alarm in persons who have reason to tremble for life and station. And the stern character of the age together with many circumstances, either imperfectly known, or wholly unknown to posterity, will account for much that was done, without giving to one of the most popular and glorious of English reigns that odious colouring in which it has been painted by sectarian pens.

§ 19. Besides the heretical and Romish sufferers under Elizabeth, five Protestant non-conformists were also executed.¹ Among them was Barrow, who revived Brownism, or Independency. These unfortunate persons were arraigned, not as traitors, but as felons; their overt acts against the established church being treated as seditious, and subversive of the public peace. The earliest of these executions occurred in 1583. None of these blots upon Elizabeth's administration attaches, therefore, to her earlier years. It was not until she was menaced by an atrocious and formidable papal conspiracy, taunted with opening the way for a pestilent flood of heresy, embarrassed by clamorous endeavours to interfere with the settlement of property, and undermine the national institutions, that any religious enemies of her policy were betrayed by the violence of their zeal to untimely deaths.²

¹ In addition to the five Puritans, or Brownists, who were hanged, Udal should be mentioned, who was convicted of felony in 1591, but died in prison. Harington's *Nugæ Antiquæ* likewise mentions another Puritan, who was condemned, but recanted.

² Besides his lives of the three archbishops, already mentioned, Strype has accumulated a vast mass of materials for studying the ecclesiastical history of Elizabeth's reign, in his *Annals*, and in his lives of Bp. Aylmer and Sir Thomas Smith. These works in the whole extend over sixteen 8vo vols. in the recent Oxford edition. The *Annals*, however, which are the regular history of the reign, contain none of the venerable compiler's writing beyond the year 1588. He was then too old for further composition, and he merely printed the vouchers which he had collected for finishing his work. A learned writer, under the signature of J. M. (probably, the Rev. Joseph Mendham) in the *British Magazine*, for July 1837, gives the following list of

Authors to be consulted upon the religious affairs of this important reign: Sanders, *De Schism. Angl.* and his *Monarchia visibilis*; Bridgewater's *Concertatio Eccl. Cath.*; Allen's *Defence*, and *Admonition to the Nobility*; the Spanish and Italian works of Ribadeneyra, Davanzati, Pollini, and Yepes; Verstegan's *Theatrum Crudelitatum Hæreticorum*, and *Eccl. Angl. Trophæa*; Ackworth and Clerk's *Answers* to Sanders; Humphrey's *Jesuitismi Pars I. the Execution of Justice*; Watson's *Important Considerations*, Donne's *Pseudo-martyr*, and the Jesuitic histories of Bartoli and Moore. Until 1839 no complete account of the religious affairs of this reign had appeared from a member of the church of England. The author of this chapter then published one, under the title of *Elizabethan Religious History*. The Dissenters had such a work in the first volume of Neal's *History of the Puritans*, to which Bp. Madox published a reply.

CHAPTER IV.

* HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

§ 1. Unsettled state of Scotland — § 2. Continued indigence of the Protestant clergy — § 3. Convention of Leith — § 4. Confirmed at Perth — § 5. Reasons assigned for the Leith agreement — § 6. Death of Knox — § 7. Injurious effects of the regent's avarice — § 8. Andrew Melville — § 9. First attacks upon episcopacy — § 10. Bishops required to undertake parochial cures — § 11. Adamson — § 12. Abolition of episcopal titles, and inhibition of new elections to sees — § 13. Abolition of episcopacy decreed at Dundee — § 14. Montgomery — § 15. The Raid of Ruthven — § 16. The French embassy — § 17. Escape of James from the Ruthven conspirators — § 18. Presbyterian *declinature* of the civil jurisdiction — § 19. The *black acts* — § 20. Interference of Elizabeth in Scottish affairs — 21. Division of the presbyterian party — § 22. Qualified admission of episcopacy — § 23. The Act of Annexation — § 24. Parliamentary extension of the popular party — § 25. The king's marriage — § 26. Successful attacks upon episcopacy, and establishment of presbyterianism — § 27. The tumult at Edinburgh, and consequent restrictions upon the presbyterian party — § 28. Petition for a representation of the clergy in Parliament — § 29. The proceedings at Dundee and Falkland — § 30. The king's literary works — § 31. The arrangements at Montrose.

§ 1. ON the settlement of religion under Elizabeth, England had a strong executive, able to contend successfully with individual selfishness, and Genevan predilections. When Scotland legally established Protestantism in 1567, her government was one of the weakest ever known. Mary's illegitimate half-brother, the regent Murray, was, indeed, a man of considerable abilities, and of more moral worth than most men would have retained under such difficulties and temptations as his. But Scotland had been little else than a turbulent, poverty-stricken aristocracy at the best of times; and when Murray undertook the chief direction of her affairs, the reins of government had long been more than usually relaxed. Nor was he ever able to hold them with a vigorous hand. The first months of his regency were those of Mary's imprisonment in Lochleven castle, from which the baffled faction was naturally anxious to deliver her, and its numbers were daily on the increase. It is true, that when Murray's painful observation of her there found a termination still more painful in her escape,¹ a few days proved enough to defeat her finally in the battle of Langside,² and to drive her into an English prison. Yet her party never was extinct, or even inert, or stationary as to numbers. There was always a harassing probability of some irresistible re-action in her favour, and Elizabeth's policy was evidently unworthy of reliance as a counterpoise. It was the southern queen's interest to keep Scotland unsettled, and consequently dependent upon

* By Mr. Soames.

¹ May 2, 1568.² May 13.

herself. Nor could it be foreseen whether this policy might not call for Mary's liberation, and the treatment of her enemies as rebels. Hence the whole of that brief interval which elapsed between Murray's acquisition of the regency and his assassination,¹ was a term in which the royal power might almost be considered as in abeyance. The Earl of Lennox, Darnley's father, who next became regent, after some months of factious anarchy,² had the means, as little as he had the ability, to establish any supreme authority worthy of the name. He was, in fact, little better than the puppet of Elizabeth. His estates lay in England, in that country his family resided, as he had long himself. Under his government, which really was little more than nominal, Scottish faction reached an intolerable height. His own partisans, known as the *King's men*, from their professed allegiance to his grandson the infant James, were constantly hurling defiance through every corner of the land against the *Queen's men*, or the adherents of Mary.³ The Marian faction even went so far as to beard his parliament by a rival parliament of its own. When his early turn came to fall by an untimely death,⁴ the Earl of Mar was elected in his place; but only to sink under the hopeless task of striving to mitigate the violence and selfishness of two uncontrollable factions. He died, however, in his bed, but overcome by care and melancholy.⁵ The Earl of Morton succeeded him, being the fourth who, in five successive years, was tempted, by a short-sighted ambition, to try the government of a lawless, distracted country. During the first year of his regency the civil war still raged; and although he subsequently was not pressed by military cares, he was equally with his miserable predecessors the head of a faction desperately struggling for existence with a formidable rival faction. Nor when the boy king was pushed forward to dislodge him from his envied but unhappy height,⁶ had Scotland even a prospect of social order. Faction never ceased for a moment from its merciless selfish struggles. From immaturity of years, James could long be little better than a puppet; and as his faculties expanded, he proved more than usually open to the interested arts of personal favourites. Thus the whole period in which the Scottish mind was forming anew after emancipation from papal bondage, displayed wealth and power as prizes not of solid worth, but of dexterous or bold rapacity. The winning candidates, however, must have a popular party at their backs, and this they could not command without religious excitement. The age was revolutionary, but its fire was fed by sectarian controversy. No scheming politician could reasonably have a hope of popular support without securing those whom pulpit-eloquence rendered powerful over inferior life. The public mind would receive a strong direction from no other source. Indeed it hardly could, at a period when the lighter literature, now found so irresistible, was unknown.

¹ Jan. 23, 1570.

² July 12, 1570.

³ Robertson's *Scotl.* ii. 336.

⁴ In the surprise of Stirling, Sept. 3, 1571.

⁵ Oct. 29, 1572.

⁶ March 24, 1578.

§ 2. The leaders, however, were very little careful of the men through whose influence over the populace their several factions obtained importance. Having made their own fortunes out of a well-endowed church, they left their clerical auxiliaries to shift for themselves. Hence those loud complaints of pinching poverty, which had justly been raised by the reformed preachers ever since the secession from Rome, were always heard, be the state of politics what it might. In 1574, the regent Morton even added to the hardships of the ministerial body. The thirds of benefices, legally settled upon it, had always been irregularly and slowly paid. From some parts of the kingdom, during the late civil wars, nothing, indeed, had been received. The collectors, therefore, appointed by the general assembly, had really been unable to satisfy properly the unfortunate claimants. Affecting to commiserate their case, Morton extorted from the clergy this source of income, engaging to substitute for it a stipend for its minister from every parish. This arrangement, however, proved illusory; clergymen were plunged into deeper poverty than ever; and in order to maintain existence, one man was under the necessity of serving four or five parishes.¹ Yet the framework of the old Roman hierarchy still survived, and though probably all were much impoverished, many of the higher clergy must have continued in easy or handsome circumstances. Thus the Protestant preachers were goaded by indigence into the constant production of exciting topics, and into envious impatience of all clerical disparity. There never is any difficulty in persuading men to disapprove of conditions above their own, and many people think of clergymen as bound in conscience to undergo whatever the ill-humour or self-interest of others would exact from them. Hence those envious feelings that extensively prevail, but especially in humbler life, gave a ready and vigorous response, when some poverty-stricken preacher denounced hierarchical appointments and endowments as unknown to the New Testament. A public extensively pervaded by such views would stop its ears against any voice from ecclesiastical antiquity, and could see no need of outward advantages to make some of the clergy fit for mixing with superior life, or to allure those literary qualifications into the church, which controversy demands. Men could insist upon their own views of a single book, who had no scholarship, or hardly any access to literature, beyond its pages. They were likely to overlook the need of higher qualifications for the ministry than their own rank seemingly required, and to consider human weapons as little better than encumbrances under an attack upon heavenly truth. Hence the Scottish hierarchy rapidly sank under an accumulation of popular odium. The temporary causes that dragged it down found no countervailing check in a respectable executive, and when the government attained, at last, some appearance of stability, inveterate

¹ 'One minister was commonly burdened with the care of four or five parishes, a pitiful salary was allotted him, and the regent's

insatiable avarice seized on the rest of the fund.' Robertson, ii. 372.

prejudice sealed a condemnation hastily pronounced amidst national convulsions.

§ 3. While public opinion continued unbiassed by any decided hostility towards prelacy, moderate men naturally felt some regard for it as one of the most venerable of national institutions. Its prostrate condition seemed also likely to bear injuriously upon the permanent interests of religion. The episcopal order and the dignified clergy were the only legal proprietors of numerous valuable estates. By keeping, therefore, vacant such of the principal preferments as happened to be so, and by rendering defenceless the incumbents of all the rest, factious leaders retained a wide opening for the seizure of religion's patrimony. In a country, however, so distracted, a violent political re-action might always be apprehended, and one class of church-robbers be reduced, at least, to the necessity of resigning its prey to another. To provide against any such contingency, an act of parliament was obtained in 1571, rendering the ecclesiastical estates already seized nominally the property of the crown, and authorising present holders to continue in possession until new titles should be granted under royal authority.¹ It was evident that powerful men, with a young child upon a disputed throne, would have no great difficulty in obtaining the required grants. Thus dispassionate minds could anticipate from the present unsettled state of ecclesiastical affairs nothing but the loss to religion of all fixed endowments, and the unearned enrichment of many private houses from sources meant for the public benefit. It was, therefore, thought advisable, Edinburgh being occupied by the queen's faction, to hold an extraordinary convention of superintendents and ministers at Leith in January, 1572. The parties convened nominated six of their body to meet as many members of the privy council. By means of this committee, it was enacted, with the regent's concurrence, that, 'in consideration of the present state,' all the ancient hierarchical arrangements, even to the preservation of abbots and priors, should continue until the king's majority, or until formally abrogated in parliament. New incumbents were, however, to be Protestants, and satisfactorily qualified.² One object in making this

¹ 'Hence, by one sweeping act, that large division of the church's patrimony, which had been seized during the troubled period subsequent to the death of James V., was converted into a royal fee, and secured in the meantime to the rapacious barons.' Russell, i. 324.

² The following is this Leith arrangement. '1. That the names and titles of the archbishops and bishops be not altered, nor the bounds of the dioceses confounded, but that they continue in time coming, as they did before the reformation of religion, at least till the king's majesty's majority, or consent of Parliament. 2. That the archbishoprics and bishoprics vacant should be conferred on men endowed, as far as may be, with the

qualities specified in the examples of Paul to Timothy and Titus. 3. That to all archbishoprics and bishoprics that should become vacant, qualified persons should be presented within a year and day after the vacancy takes place, and those nominated to be thirty years of age at the least. 4. That the spiritual jurisdiction should be exercised by the bishops in their dioceses. 5. That abbots, priors, and inferior prelates, presented to benefices, should be tried, as to their qualification, and their aptness to give a voice in parliament, by the bishop, or superintendent of the bounds, and upon their collation, should be admitted to the benefice, but not otherwise. 6. That the elections of persons presented to bishoprics

arrangement was to revive the influence of religion in parliament. Deprived of her legislative voice, the church had been easy to pillage and oppress. Hence all who felt that religious institutions, like all others, require adequate pecuniary support, and who respected clerical rights, were anxious to see the spiritual profession again in a position to maintain its due place in the national assemblies. They were even willing to sanction the anomalous appearance in a Protestant legislature, of beneficiaries, who represented monastic properties, and who professed Protestantism themselves. The first considerations were to stay the progress of sacrilegious avarice, and to give churchmen once more adequate means of self-defence. The complete obviation of defects in the plan might be contentedly left to a more tranquil time, when a sovereign in reality, and not in name only, should head the nation, or a parliament, really at liberty for calm deliberation and constitutionally leavened by an ecclesiastical spirit, should prescribe the details of a final religious settlement.

§ 4. As the agreement of Leith is undoubtedly some sort of sanction given to episcopacy, and by men who stood foremost in the Scottish reformation, considerable speculation has arisen as to Knox's views upon the question. That eminent preacher, and strong-minded virtuous man, was not present. He had been stricken with apoplexy in October, 1570, and although very much recovered, his energies ever afterwards required careful husbanding. He appears, however, to have approved what was done at Leith. It is, indeed, far from unlikely that his approbation had been given to some such plan before it came under public discussion. Otherwise, from the vehemence of his character, and his imposing weight in the country, he would hardly have written as he did to the general assembly in the following August. That body, which was regularly convened at Perth, entered into a formal consideration of the Leith arrangement.¹ As the members, from habits of declamation against the ancient hierarchy, might have incurred a charge of inconsistency, if they now silently sanctioned its continuance, even in name, provision was made against any such blemish to their characters. The assembly declared that, in restoring episcopal, capitular, and archidiaconal designations, it meant no countenance to popery or superstition, being really anxious to have those names changed for such as were 'not scandalous and offensive.' In the meantime it adopted what was agreed upon

should be made by the chapters of the cathedral churches; and because the chapters of divers churches were possessed by men provided before his majesty's coronation, who bore no office in the church, that a particular nomination of ministers should be made in every diocese, to supply their rooms, until the benefice should fall void. 7. That all benefices with cure, under prelaties, should be conferred on actual ministers, and on no others. 8. That ministers should receive ordination from the bishop of the diocese, and where no bishop was as

yet placed, from the superintendent of the bounds. 9. That ministers and superintendents should exact an oath, at the ordination of ministers, for acknowledging his majesty's authority, and for obedience to their ordinary in all things.' Russell, i, 329.

¹ The Leith 'regulations were submitted to the general assembly at St. Andrew's; but as that meeting was thinly attended, it came to no determination respecting them.' M'Crie's *Knox*, ii. 199.

at Leith, as a temporary arrangement until some better could be obtained from the regent and nobility. Knox's letter, delivered by his two friends, Winram and Pont, requested the brethren to provide by a formal enactment, 'that all bishoprics vacant may be filled by qualified persons within a year of the vacancy, *according to the order taken in Leith, by the commissioners of the nobility and the Kirk, in the month of January last.*'¹ Had not a majority of the great Scottish reformer's countrymen repudiated episcopacy, these words of his would have had very little chance of bearing any construction unfavourable to that system, or to the Leith agreement. This latter was not, indeed, contemplated as a final settlement, either by Knox or by those who framed it. The question is, did they mean it as a prelude to the establishment of a regular protestant episcopate, when everything should be sufficiently considered, and the country sufficiently settled, for such a purpose? An intelligent minority in Scotland, and most people elsewhere, have ever answered this question affirmatively. Relying upon the appointment of superintendents, more than ten years before, and the proposal now to revive bishops, chapters, and archdeacons, they considered the Scottish reformation as originally planned with an intention to protestantise the ancient hierarchy, and adapt it judiciously to the altered circumstances of the country; but by no means to sweep it quite away, as a popish incumbrance which must impede and discredit a scriptural faith.

§ 5. Among those who consider the Scottish reformers as irreconcilably hostile to episcopacy from the first, some have attributed the Leith agreement to a temporary desire of English approbation, and the absence of Knox.² The former is, however, a far-fetched reason, and the latter stands upon a supposition of no solidity, Knox, as has been seen, being probably all along a consenting party. Others paint the Leith commissioners as mere dupes and tools of a rapacious court. Their arrangement is thought nothing else than a new device of the faction-leaders to secure church plunder. It was only bishops and dignified clergymen who yet could hold a vast mass of eagerly-coveted property, by such titles as were likely to stand a legal scrutiny, whenever the country should become thoroughly settled. Let prelacies and dignities, therefore, continue, and let such as had interest enough to put incumbents into them make the nominees pay most exorbitantly for their patronage.³ This explanation has the advantage of resting on a fact. The Earl of Morton, then chancellor, obtained

¹ Russell, i. 332.

² 'The Scots were then under some necessity of holding fair quarter with the English, and therefore, to conform, as near as conveniently they might, to the government of it in the outward polity of the church. Upon which reason, and the prevalence of court commissioners, those of the Kirk did condescend unto these conclusions; and condescended the more easily, because Knox was absent, detained by sickness from attempting any public business.'

(Heylin's *History of the Presbyterians*, Lond. 1672, p. 180.)

³ 'The design of securing the richest portion of the benefices to the court and its dependents, which gave rise to the whole scheme, and which is the only thing that can account for its strange incongruities, did not appear in any part of the details. This was tacitly understood, and left to be provided for by secret treaty between individual patrons and presentees.' M'Crie's *Life of Andrew Melville*, Edinb. 1824, i. 103.

the vacant archbishopric of St. Andrew's for John Douglas, rector of the university there, previously stipulating for a large portion of its revenues. This simoniacal pact soon became sufficiently notorious, and the general assembly protested against it to the parliament, holden at Stirling, in 1571. The simoniac, however, though not yet elected, had sufficient influence to take his seat in that very parliament; the body that nominally made so much ecclesiastical property into crown lands, really, into private inheritances.¹ In the following February, Douglas was inaugurated,² and Morton wanted Knox to give that ceremony his powerful sanction, by taking the lead in it. But the reformer indignantly refused, hurling strong reprobation at both archbishop and patron. Now, it is far from unlikely, that a corrupt eye to similar transactions might have had considerable influence upon the lay parties to the agreement of Leith, and a desire to save as much ecclesiastical property as possible might have operated upon the clerical parties. The sort of episcopacy which the Leith convention enacted, and the Perth assembly confirmed, has accordingly been called in derision *tulchan*, some people being reminded by it of a Highland stratagem to make reluctant cows give down their milk.³ But although, among these individuals, there are many of great acuteness, and of high qualifications in every other respect, they really throw such imputations by their hypothesis, upon either the honesty, or the intelligence, or both, of the clerical portion of the Leith committee, as it could hardly deserve.⁴ It may be true that Morton's advice led Mar, the regent, to summon the Leith convention,⁵ but it

¹ M'Crie's *Knox*, ii. 198.

² Adamson, who succeeded Douglas, preaching, about the time of his inauguration, said, 'There are three sorts of bishops; my lord bishop, my lord's bishop, and the Lord's bishop. My lord bishop was in the time of popery; my lord's bishop is now, when my lord gets the benefice, and the bishop serves for nothing but to make his title sure; the Lord's bishop is a true minister of the gospel.' Adamson is said to have been disappointed of the archbishopric that time himself. M'Crie's *Melville*, ii. 486.

³ 'In allusion to a custom in the Highlands of Scotland of placing a calf's skin stuffed with straw, called a *tulchan*, before cows, to induce them to give their milk, those who occupied the episcopal office at this time, were called *tulchan bishops*.' *Ibid.* i. 103.

⁴ 'No reproach more severe could be thrown upon the honesty and intelligence of the ministers, who represented their brethren in the conference held with the lay deputies commissioned by the regent. Three of those selected for this purpose, namely, Erskine of Dun, the superintendent of Angus; Winram, the superintendent of Fife; and Craig, one of the ministers of

Edinburgh, were the intimate friends of Knox.' Russell, i. 334.

⁵ 'Hoc ipso tamen anno (1571) proceres quidam, qui episcopatus aliaque beneficia minora invaserant, de jure suo dubitantes, episcopos invexerunt qui titulo beneficii gauderent et ampliori stipendio, ipsis tamen reliquum interceptiendi jus concederent vel permitterent, quod in minoribus etiam sacerdotiis ut fieret contendebant. Ergo Mortonus Marrio, qui tum vices regis pueruli gerebat, auctor fuit, ut per Dunensem Comarchum, Angusiæ superintendentem, virum nobilem, Synodum convocaret, Letham.' (Calderwood, *Epist. Philad. Vind.* apud *Altare Damascenum*, Lugd. Bat. 1708, p. 727.) 'But it does not appear that the court at this time assumed the right of calling assemblies; and it is well known, that the clergy in those days were little disposed to submit to court influence. The assembly was, in fact, convened by the rulers of the church, the superintendents and commissioners. Spotswood remarks, that in the month of January an assembly of the church convened at Leith, where, after great instance made with the regent and council for settling the policy of the church, it was agreed, &c. The entreaty was on the part of the ministers. It is farther deserving of

is not very likely that the assembled clergy delegated their powers to six members of their own body, capable of egregious simplicity or barefaced corruption. Nor is it likely, that the convention accepted an arrangement wholly foreign to its own views, and originating in a smaller section manifestly over-reached, or bribed by an avaricious council. It may also be fairly, no less than charitably doubted, whether even the court nominees were so totally destitute of integrity, as this hypothesis would make them. Most observers will, however, infer from the acts of 1572, that an indefinite horror of episcopacy had not then become interwoven with the religious creed of Scotland. It is true, that the system then enacted was of a most anomalous description, and such as episcopalians are very far from approving.¹ But it might be thought, and it probably was, the best temporary expedient that could be adopted in a country long devoured by faction, and disorganised by civil war. That it should have been adopted by its clerical supporters as a preparative for the abolition of the very system which it placed on a firmer footing than had been known for many years, is a supposition that requires previous prepossession. But nothing could be more reasonable as a preparative for the judicious adaptation of the old system to a protestant country, as soon as tranquillity should allow divines to mature plans for the purpose, and statesmen to carry them into execution.

§ 6. During the convention of Leith, Knox was living at St. Andrew's, whither he had retired in the preceding May. His declining health had withdrawn him in an unusual degree from political strife, but the regent Murray's assassination overclouded every prospect of public tranquillity, and he could no longer forbear. His passions were more energetically aroused, because he had the mortification, common in civil wars, of seeing some unexpected and embarrassing

notice, that, by the *Agreement of Leith*, express provision was made against simony and dilapidations of benefices, a fact not very consistent with the allegation, that the said *Agreement* was forced upon the clergy by the court, and proceeding upon a design on the part of the latter upon the revenues of the church.' Russell, i. 335.

¹ 'It was a constitution of the most motley and heterogeneous kind, being made up of presbytery, episcopacy, and papal monkery. Viewed in one light, indeed, it might be considered harmless. It made little or no alteration on the established discipline of the church. The bishops were invested with no episcopal authority; and if unfit persons were admitted to the office, the general assembly, to whose jurisdiction they were subjected, might suspend or depose them, and call the chapters to account for their irregular conduct. Nor were the monastic prelates, as such, entitled to a place in the church courts.' (M'Crie's *Melville*, i. 100.) Among these bishops, too, was Robert Stuart, brother to the Earl

of Lennox, who was elected to the see of Caithness, and confirmed by the pope, as administrator of the cathedral there, when very young, but who never took even priest's orders. He was, however, called bishop of Caithness, to the day of his death, in 1586, being invested with the revenues of that see, and with those of the priory of St. Andrew's; a benefice given him by his brother, during his regency. Having been a warm partisan of his brother's in early life, he was compelled to abscond on the ascendancy of Arran's faction, and he remained out of the way during 22 years. On his return, he became a Protestant, and married a daughter of the earl of Atholl, but left no legitimate issue. Though really never possessed of any sacred character, he was associated by the government in the commission for consecrating Douglas to the see of St. Andrew's; the name and revenues of a bishop, seemingly, being thought sufficient qualification. (Keith, 216.) The times neither allowed leisure for examining principles, nor facilities for preserving regularity.

changes of side. Kirkaldy of Grange especially, who had been conspicuous for adherence to the protestant party, turned round, and transferred the important castle of Edinburgh, of which he was governor, to the queen's faction. This was a severe blow upon Knox, and the governor's forcible delivery from the tolbooth of a soldier charged with murder, drew from him a storm of indignant pulpit-eloquence, which was warmly resented in the castle. To render his position more insecure, Kirkaldy admitted his inveterate enemies, the Hamiltons, into the castle, in April, 1571. The reformer's personal safety now became very doubtful, especially as Hamilton would not answer for it, alleging the impossibility of watching sufficiently over the bad characters in a band of soldiers that hated him. Upon this he was earnestly urged to flee; but his friends could not prevail, until they told him that innocent blood could hardly fail of being shed if he stayed, the garrison's hostility being fully equalled by their own resolution to defend him. Such a contingency he would not hazard, and a reluctant consent was accordingly given for his departure. Leith was in the possession of his friends, the regent having fortified it; but it was evidently undesirable to retain at the very seat of war, a sick man whom the enemy abhorred, but who still could muster ample energy to fire his friends. Knox, therefore, merely passed through Leith, and crossing the Firth, went by easy stages to St. Andrew's, where he seasoned his sermons, as at Edinburgh, with stirring comments on the national dissensions. Most of his hearers probably found this style of preaching highly palatable, but it made as many enemies as friends; the Hamiltons, though not in arms, being powerful both in the university and neighbourhood. In return, reports to the preacher's disadvantage were industriously spread, and strife of every kind thickened around him. He was then exceedingly infirm, quite unable to get into the pulpit without a great deal of help, and for the first half-hour of his sermon, the congregation found itself listening to the calm effusions of an able, but a worn-out old man. When once, however, thoroughly warmed by his subject, every symptom of exhaustion vanished, and a torrent of racy vehemence, with violent muscular exertion, seemed to threaten even the pulpit with destruction.¹ Nevertheless, he was evidently sinking, and death appeared likely to overtake him at St. Andrew's. However, before the close of July, 1572, the queen's party evacuated the city of Edinburgh, retaining only possession of the castle. The citizens of the opposite faction

¹ 'In the opening up of his text, he was moderat the space of an half-houre; but when he enterit to application, he made me so to grew (thrill) and tremble, that I could not hald a pen to wryt. He was very weik. I saw him everie day of his doctrine, go *hulie and fear* (slowly and warily) with a furring of marticks about his neck, a staffe in the ane hand, and gud, godlie Richart Ballanden, his servand, haldin up the other *oxter* (arm-pit) from the abbey to the parish-

kirk, and be the said Richart, and another servand, lifted up to the pulpit, whar he behovit to lean at his first entrie; bot, er he haid done with his sermone, he was so active and vigorous, that he was lyk to *ding the pulpit in blads* (beat the pulpit to pieces) and fleie out of it.' Account of James Melville, then student at St. Andrew's, afterwards minister of Anstruther, *apud* M'Crie, *Knox*, ii. 206.

returned immediately to their houses, and lost no time in requesting Knox to do the same. After stipulating that no restrictions were to be placed upon his tongue as to the Marian factionists in the castle, he consented, and left St. Andrew's, as much to the satisfaction of one party there as to the regret of the other.¹ He came to Edinburgh about the end of August; but his voice could no longer fill a spacious building, and a small place was provided for him. His last public appearance was, however, made in a large church, when, on the 9th of November, 1572, he presided at the installation of a colleague and successor. He was very imperfectly heard, and his congregation, as he retired home, lined the street in expectation of seeing him no more. He died on the 24th of that month, calmly and religiously, leaving a name behind him of which Scotland has been justly proud ever since. Within two days, he was buried in the church-yard of St. Giles, the Earl of Morton, then newly elected regent, and many of the nobility, with a vast concourse of people, being in attendance. Morton thus forcibly and truly pronounced his funeral eulogy, *There lies he who never feared the face of man*.² It was this complete intrepidity which rendered him so invaluable as the religious leader of a distracted period.³ In professional acquirements, Knox has often

¹ He declared those in the castle to be men 'whose treasonable and tyrannical deeds he would cry out against, as long as he was able to speak.' M'Crie's *Knox*, ii. 211.

² *Ibid.* 234. Knox was twice married, and by his first wife, Margaret Bowes, he left two sons, both educated academically at St. John's college, Cambridge, of whom the elder, Nathaniel, died fellow in 1580. The younger, Eleazer, died vicar of Clacton magna, in Essex, in 1591. Neither appears to have left issue. Their mother, whose father was of the wealthy family seated at Streatham castle in the county-palatine of Durham, died in 1560, after an union of about seven years. Such a house as that from which this lady's father sprang was naturally unwilling to receive a man of Knox's condition among its members, and without her mother's aid, his suit would probably have failed. In 1564, Knox made another ambitious match, marrying Margaret Stewart, daughter of Lord Ochiltree, descended from the duke of Albany, second son of Robert II. 'By this lady, who survived him, and married again, he left three daughters, eventually all married to ministers. His two sons were sent into England, about the year 1566, to be with their deceased mother's relations. Upon the occasion of his second marriage, more especially, the Romish writers rail at Knox's lust and ambition: and it must be owned, that a widower of humble birth, verging upon sixty, did lay himself open to animadversion by this connexion. It is natural also that men rigidly restrained from the

domestic comforts and external advantages attainable by marriage, should represent individuals of their own body who set these restraints at defiance, gratifying inclination, and gaining station by this boldness, as really deserters from Rome from no higher motive. Nor is the ridiculous picture of Knox going to court his second wife, either improbable, or unfairly preserved by a writer of a church which the reformer himself loaded with abuse. 'Rydan and thairwith ane gret court, on ane trim gelding, nocht lyk ane prophet, or ane auld decrepit priest, as he was, bot lyk as he had bene ane of the blude royal, with his bendes of taffetie feschnit with golden ringis, and precious stanes.' Unfortunately for his weight with posterity, the painter of this amusing portrait goes on to ascribe Knox's success with the lady to witchcraft, and to say that she was frightened to death, soon after marriage, by seeing in her chamber, 'a blak, ugie, ill-favoured man busily talking with' the bridegroom. (*Ibid.* 328.) It was not enough to lower the tone of Knox's admirers, by showing him to have gained human ends by human means, and hence to argue that a lurking love of such ends may fairly be considered as one incentive to his war with Rome. The age required unfriendly painters to display him as an especial emissary of Satan, in the closest connexion with his employer, and thus enabled to make a figure in the world.

³ 'He was certainly a man endued with rare gifts, and a chief instrument that God used for the work of those times. Many

been surpassed, in the fearless discharge of all that he considered his duty, never.

§ 7. As Morton's government put an end to the civil war, and was far better established than that of any former regent, he might, probably, have rendered the Leith agreement permanently binding on the country. The effects of protracted anarchy were, indeed, sufficiently conspicuous in the neglect of established principles, when the church first assembled after the late arrangement. The primate was present, but a parochial clergyman was chosen to preside.¹ Such irregularities could hardly be prevented in an unsettled establishment which recognised both bishops and superintendents with some sort of equal and ill-defined authority over the same districts. But had the system been left undisturbed by extraneous circumstances, there can be no doubt that superintendents would have gradually disappeared, leaving the ground wholly open for the organisation of a regular Protestant episcopacy. As usual, however, the avarice and necessities of power would not allow the ordinary course of events. Morton had made himself sole paymaster of the clergy, and they never had a worse.² Hence their pecuniary difficulties, and the burdensome duties which they undertook to support existence, kept up all their old dissatisfaction, and its natural operation upon the quality of their discourses. The regent's insatiable greediness could not even spare the superintendents. That order found itself involved in the same wretched necessity that pinched inferior ministers, and urgent appeals to the treasury were met by a wanton and unfeeling answer, that, bishops being recognised again, superintendents were become useless, and could not be suffered long to burden the country at all. Present holders of the office were, however, compensated by a diminished allowance.³ Three of the body thus impoverished and insulted,⁴ requested the general assembly, in March, 1574, to accept of their resignations. They were men who had stood high in the reformation, and accordingly, the assembly, instead of accepting the proffered resignations, enacted that bishops should not exercise jurisdiction within districts provided with superintendents, unless these latter should

good men have disliked some of his opinions, as touching the authority of princes, and the form of government which he laboured to have established in the church: yet he was far from those dotages, wherein some, that would have been thought his followers, afterwards fell; for never was any man more observant of church authority than he, always urging the obedience of ministers to their superintendents, for which he caused divers acts to be made in the assemblies of the church, and showed himself severe to the transgressors.' Spotswood, 267.

¹ Russell, i. 346.

² 'In the payment of these pensions they found their condition made worse than before it was: for, whereas they could boldly go to the superintendents and make their poor estates known unto them, from

whom they were sure to receive some relief and comfort, they were now forced to dance attendance at the court for getting warrants for the payment of the sums assigned, and supplicating for such augmentations as were seldom granted. And when the Kirk desired to be restored unto the thirds, as was also promised in case the assignations were not duly paid, it was at last told them in plain terms, *that since the surplus of the thirds belonged to the king, it was fitter the regent and council should modify the stipends of ministers, than that the Kirk should have the appointment and designation of a surplus.*' Heylin, *Hist. Presb.* p. 181.

³ Collier, ii. 548.

⁴ *Viz.* Erskine of Dun, Spotswood, and Winram.

consent.¹ By such acts, the principles recognised at Leith were undermined, and a foundation was laid for those dissensions which agitated Scotland during more than a century afterwards. Presbyterians ordinarily represent such irregularities as evidence that episcopacy was only set up again for a temporary blind. Others have at least equal reason for viewing them as extorted by the severe pressure of circumstances, at a time when the universal prevalence of civil discord allowed neither an accurate acquaintance with sound principles, nor sufficient consistency to the national institutions.

§ 8. While opinions and institutions continued thus unsettled, Andrew Melville returned home after an absence of ten years in foreign countries. He was the youngest of nine sons born to the proprietor of Baldovy, a small estate in Angus, where his own birth occurred in 1545. Within two years afterwards, his father fell in the disastrous rout of Pinky, and his mother dying within a short period, he was left an orphan under the care of his eldest brother, who, seeing his taste for learning, kindly gave him a superior education. Having exhausted, with great applause, all such means of instruction as his own country afforded, he went at nineteen to the university of Paris. He studied there two years, and afterwards at Poitiers; but by far the greatest portion of his continental residence was spent at Geneva. His family had early embraced the Reformation, and Beza, with whom he became intimately acquainted, rendered him a thorough convert to the presbyterian system. So little, however, seems to have been known of this in his own country, that, on his arrival there, in 1574, the regent Morton, who has been censured as a decided favourer of episcopacy,² would have taken him into his establishment.³ The overture was declined, but he accepted one soon afterwards from James Boyd, archbishop of Glasgow, to become principal of the college there. If he had been known to entertain the opinions, which, far more than his learning, have earned him celebrity, such an invitation from such quarters would hardly have been given. The friends of his memory, indeed, admit him to have acted, during this portion of his life, with ‘great prudence.’⁴ Those who dislike the system so closely connected

¹ ‘This regulation, which was obviously suggested by the injudicious conduct of the regent, has been appealed to as a proof, that the church was still inclined, notwithstanding their acceptance of the new model, to prefer superintendents to bishops. Impartially considered, it will not support that inference. To those who have no hypothesis to maintain, nor predilections to gratify, it can appear in no other light than that of a generous effort to vindicate the rank and authority of an order of ecclesiastical magistrates, whose merits had been undervalued, and whose emoluments had been unjustly withdrawn.’ Russell, i. 348.

² ‘Episcopis semper favebat, et illum ordinem contra ecclesiam summa ope promovebat.’ Calderwood, *Epist. Philad. Vind.* apud *Altare Damascenum*, p. 730.

³ ‘Melville had scarcely arrived at Edinburgh, when he was waited on by George Buchanan, Alexander Hay, clerk to the privy council, and Colonel James Halyburton, a favourite of the regent Morton. They proposed that he should act as domestic instructor to the regent, promising that he should be advanced to a situation more suited to his merits, on the first vacancy which occurred. Morton had himself no taste for letters, and was not disposed, as his predecessors were, to be liberal to learned men. But his sagacity convinced him of the influence which they exerted over the minds of others, and of the importance of attaching them to his interests.’ M’Crie’s *Melville*, i. 58.

⁴ Russell, i. 353.

with his name, would rather accuse him, at this time, of considerable duplicity. His own account gives countenance to such a charge. He does not allow posterity to suppose that presbyterian convictions gradually strengthened in his mind from deeper inquiry into ecclesiastical antiquity, and observation of the country. Writing to Beza, in 1579, he declares himself to have fought against pseudo-episcopacy unceasingly during the last five years:¹ that is to say, from the very date of his arrival in Scotland, when he had an offer of patronage from a regent episcopally disposed, and when he actually took office under an archbishop.

§ 9. The first portion of this protracted fight produced no aggressive acts more serious than private conversations. In these, however, the ground was prepared. Melville thus became acquainted with the views taken by various individuals of weight, and with the parties most likely to be influenced by himself. The introduction of topics fitted for his purpose really required little or no management. In few things had recent national disorders acted more strikingly upon the country, than in producing the motley aspect and unsettled posture of its ecclesiastical affairs. In a convention of estates, accordingly, holden at Edinburgh, in March 1575, it was voted, ‘that great inconveniences had arisen, and were likely to arise, from the want of a decent and comely government in the church.’ In consequence, a parliamentary committee was appointed to concert with certain ministers of the general assembly, then sitting, some form of ecclesiastical polity suitable at once to God’s Word and the national wants. Melville sat as a member of this general assembly, and he was one of those nominated to deliberate with the parliamentary commissioners. He was thus able to prepare the way for the system eventually made public in the *Second Book of Discipline*.² In the meanwhile another meeting of the general assembly took place in the August of 1575. According to custom, the business was about to begin with an inquiry into the conduct of the bishops and superintendents since the general assembly last met.³ Dury, however, one of the Edinburgh ministers,

¹ ‘Notwithstanding the opposition we have met with from many of the nobility,’ Collier, ii. 534.

² M’Crie’s *Melville*, i. 110. The *Second Book of Discipline* may be seen in Collier (ii. 563), who says that it is chiefly compiled from Beza’s tract, *De triplici Episcopatu*, and his answer to the questions of Lord Glamis. A general analysis of this famous *Book* is given by Dr. M’Crie (*Melville*, i. 119). It is thoroughly pontifical in maintaining ecclesiastical privileges, but it lodges them in a democratic body, consisting of ‘ministers, who are preachers as well as rulers; elders, who are merely rulers, and deacons, who act as distributors of alms, and managers of the funds of the church.’ Besides these, ‘is the doctor, or teacher, whose function lies in expounding the Scriptures, defending the truth against erroneous

teachers, and instructing the youth in schools, colleges, and universities.’ The elderships are said to be sanctioned by the primitive church, which had its ‘colleges of seniors constituted in cities and famous places.’ On which Collier observes, ‘This assertion has no countenance from antiquity: ’tis not supported with so much as any single instance from the primitive church.’ He also remarks, ‘This *Book of Discipline* mentions presbyteries, states their powers, and describes the members of which they were to consist; but notwithstanding their insisting so much upon this subject, there were no such ecclesiastical assemblies then in being. The first presbytery in that nation was set up in Edinburgh: but then this was not done till May, 1681.’

³ Russell, i. 354.

rose and protested against any inference from such inquiry as to the assembly's approbation of episcopacy.¹ On this opening Melville delivered an elaborate speech, to prove prelacy unscriptural, unwarranted by primitive antiquity, and practically injurious. To reinforce his arguments, he gave personal testimony to the excellent working of presbyterianism in France, and at Geneva; and he attributed many of the evils complained of in England, to its rejection.² Six prelates were present, besides two superintendents,³ but seldom has the abuse of patronage appeared more glaringly, or acted so injuriously, as in the state of the Scottish episcopal bench at that time. As usual, none of these mitred members found a word to say. Thus an opposition to their office, which has been commonly considered as the fruit of a collusion between Dury and Melville, wholly escaped resistance and exposure.⁴ Yet the speaker was only just turned of thirty, the line

¹ 'This Dury, as Spotswood represents him, was a well-meaning, undissembling man, open in declaring his mind, and zealous in maintaining his opinion; but then he was somewhat ungarded in his management, had an over-balance of belief, and was easily imposed on.' Collier, ii. 550.

² 'The maintenance of the hierarchy in England he could not but consider as one cause of the rarity of preaching, the poverty of the lower orders of the clergy, pluralities, want of discipline, and other abuses which had produced dissensions and heart-burnings in that flourishing kingdom.' (M'Crie's *Melville*, i. 112.) Had the speaker known anything accurately of England, it may be hoped that all this rhetoric, except as to 'want of discipline,' would have been spared. There is no doubt that the hierarchy was a main obstacle to the studding of England with an organised ramification of petty, meddling, intolerant courts, in which Puritanical ministers and ruling elders might authoritatively measure every neighbour's conduct and creed by their own notions of morals and divinity. It is equally certain, that many able and conscientious men thought such courts very highly desirable, if not absolutely necessary, and that immorality might really have been often repressed by their means. But it is not certain, that the country would have borne them, even if episcopal opponents had not disputed their claims to confidence; or that their operation over a large community could have been rendered beneficial upon the whole: while their narrow, intrusive, intolerant character must have been widely felt as offensive and tyrannical. As to 'the rarity of preaching,' Romish habits, in which the public mind was generally formed, rendered a large portion of the people indifferent to it. There were also obvious reasons why all clergymen should not be allowed to preach. Great

numbers had taken their benefices before Elizabeth's accession, and, though now conformists, were known to be Romanists at heart. These men were no safe preachers, and many of them, besides, were hardly competent. Others, who were zealous protestants, and sufficiently competent, had little discretion, but were likely to outrage the Romishly-inclined, who were gradually laying aside old prepossessions, by their violent invectives against Romanism, and to undermine the church which gave them bread, by their puritanical doctrine. Both clerical poverty and pluralities have always been largely attributable to the smallness of many parishes, and the great number of impropriations. To say nothing of the justice and expediency of making the church a liberal profession, which it cannot be without adequate remuneration, it is absurd to talk of one measure as applicable to all parishes; whereas one parish contains from 300 to 500 acres, with a population of from 50 to 150 souls, another contains many thousand acres, with a corresponding population, or is a densely-peopled town. It is obvious, that a respectable maintenance cannot be raised for its minister from a very small parish, even where it is a rectory; and it is notorious, that a very large portion of the more extensive parishes consists of vicarages and perpetual curacies, which seldom leave a comfortable income to the minister, often nothing better than a mere pittance. Most of the church's endowment in these very numerous parishes is a private estate. Thus Melville's English illustrations were very far from trustworthy, however they might have answered a temporary purpose.

³ The archbishop of Glasgow was at the head of the prelates. Collier, ii. 550.

⁴ Dr. M'Crie writes as if Melville knew nothing of Dury's intention, though he subsequently speaks of it as likely to have been otherwise. The episcopal writers are

of scholarship to which his arguments referred had notoriously not been made his especial study,¹ the statements offered had himself only for their voucher, and upon the English portion of them, at any rate, his authority was evidently of no great value. The assembly generally seemed, however, unconscious of any such objections, and listened with applause. When this had a little subsided, the following questions were proposed,—Have bishops, as now constituted in Scotland, any scriptural warrant for their office; and are chapters, by which they are elected, endurable in a reformed church? Any answers to these queries, at all worthy of a grave assembly, evidently required deliberation. A committee of six was accordingly appointed, three on the episcopal side, and three on the presbyterian, to discuss and report.² Melville was one of the presbyterians chosen. The report

unanimous in treating the whole affair as concerted between the two.

¹ 'Archbishop Spotswood, whose ambitious views he' (Melville) 'long crossed, and who has never mentioned his name with temper in the course of his history, set an example of this treatment: and we shall quote his words, which subsequent writers of the same description have done little more than repeated. *In the church, this year, began the innovations to break forth that to this day have kept it in a continual inquietness. Mr. Andrew Melvil, who was lately come from Geneva, a man learned (chiefly in the tongues), but hot and eager upon anything he went about, labouring with a burning desire to bring into this church the presbyterian discipline of Geneva, and having insinuated himself into the favour of divers preachers, he stirred up John Dury, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, in an assembly which was then convened, to propound a question touching the lawfulness of the episcopal function, and the authority of chapters in their election. He himself, as though he had not been acquainted with the motion, after he had commended the speaker's zeal, and seconded the purpose with a long discourse of the flourishing estate of the church of Geneva, and the opinion of Calvin and Theodore Beza concerning church-government,—in end he said, that the corruptions crept into the estate of bishops were so great, as unless the same were removed, it could not go well with the church.*' (M'Crie's Melville, i. 127.) Dr. M'Crie pronounces this account a *libel*. He first excepts against it, as insinuating that the church was tranquil, when, in fact, a protest had been made against the consecration of Douglas to St. Andrew's, another at Perth against episcopal and caputular titles, and a motion had been made in the general assembly of 1573, by the archbishop's own father, the superintendent Spotswood, against the civil duties of

bishops. The insinuation, however, complained of is not very obvious. As to the Genevese part of the question, it is asserted, that no contemporary Scottish or English bishop was comparable to Calvin or Beza, but that notwithstanding, neither Knox nor Melville was a servile imitator of those great men; and in a note is cited with applause, Calderwood's expression of wonder that Melville should be thought enamoured of presbytery by a five years' residence at Geneva, whereas Spotswood readily deserted it, after a ten years' experience at home. All this, however, is evasive. It is only meant, by mentioning Geneva, to account for Melville's predilections, without referring them to any deeply-matured, scholarly conviction. He went to Geneva, when about four-and-twenty, and the notice of a man so celebrated as Beza, might fairly be thought to influence unduly the judgment of a person so very young; that Melville's learning was chiefly philological, is represented as a natural remark enough from a man like Spotswood, who 'was no great scholar,' but quite out of keeping with the stress laid on that branch of learning by the divines of modern England. The whole drift of Spotswood, however, is only to mark, that Melville's learning had not been turned sufficiently to the question that he undertook to discuss. His previous knowledge of Dury's intention is treated as not unlikely, but no reflexion upon either, even if it were so. This must, however, depend upon what they said, and how they said it. Upon the whole, Spotswood's account seems not to have been proved a *libel*. But it certainly places the introduction of presbyterianism to Scotland upon lower grounds than its friends might wish.

² 'Great care was took by Melvin and his adherents, that neither any of the bishops nor superintendents which were then present in the assembly (being eight in number) were either nominated to de-

was brought up after a lapse of two days. This evaded the main question, pronouncing a decision upon the scriptural authority of episcopacy to be then inexpedient; but recommending the deposition of any bishop found wanting by the general assembly, in the qualities required by God's Word. The name of *bishop* was pronounced common to all ministers charged with a particular flock: his offices were preaching, administering the sacraments, and exercising discipline in conjunction with the elders. Among the clergy within a reasonable compass, it was, however, recommended, that some be selected as visitors and overseers of this district, who might appoint preachers, and suspend ministers with consent of the respective flocks, and advice of their brethren in the ministry.¹

§ 10. As this recommendation really affirmed the expediency, either of the old system or of some modification of it, the presbyterian party would not let it rest. At the next general assembly, accordingly, holden in April 1576, it was debated, 'whether episcopal functions, as then exercised in Scotland, had any scriptural warrant?' Again, however, the anti-episcopalians received a check. Nothing further could be gained upon the abstract question, than a renewed approval of the articles that had been passed at the last meeting. But the innovators, notwithstanding, secured a step in advance. It was enacted, that bishops must undertake parochial cures, and fulfil the duties of them like ordinary clergymen.² Another blow was levelled at episcopacy in the person of James Paton, bishop of Dunkeld, with whom the assembly interfered in some way displeasing to the regent;³ and that nobleman, in consequence, desired to know whether the Leith Agreement was to stand; recommending the immediate preparation of some other scheme, if it were to be overthrown. This message was highly palatable to the enemies of prelacy. A committee was immediately appointed, in which Melville was included, and after long deliberations it produced the *Second Book of Discipline*. Boyd, archbishop of Glasgow, it is said, was originally nominated a commissioner. Undoubtedly, when reminded of the assembly's late vote, requiring all prelates to undertake some particular parochial cure, he pleaded a conscientious inability to obey such a regulation. He had entered upon his see in consequence of the Leith Agreement, which was to continue in force until the king's majority, or some statutable provision to the contrary. He had

bate the points proposed, nor called to be present at the conference.' Heylin, *Hist. Presb.* 183.

¹ And here, notwithstanding the Presbyterians gained some ground in putting episcopacy to the question, yet they fell short of their purpose; for they could not prevail for a decision against the function.' (Collier, ii. 550.) 'On the contrary, it was admitted as a suitable arrangement, that from among the ministers some might be chosen to oversee and visit, provided the bounds were reasonable, and the consent of

the general assembly not refused.' Russell, i. 358.

² Collier, ii. 558.

³ Collier says that the assembly deposed Paton. Keith says, 'It is reported, that Bishop Paton was deprived in the year 1575 for dilapidation of his benefice.' (97.) The case appears obscure. Dr. Russell accordingly says, 'The regent, irritated against some acts of discipline adopted against Paton the ordinary of Dunkeld,' i. 360.

also taken an oath to respect the royal prerogatives, and might, therefore, incur the guilt of perjury, if he should alter his legal position, the king being still a minor, and parliament having authorised no change. He professed himself, however, willing to meet the assembly's views half-way, and become a constant preacher. When at Glasgow, he should preach there; when at his house, in the sheriffdom of Ayr, he would preach in any church that might be assigned him: it being understood that he was not absolutely bound to any one church, or expected to do anything at variance with his episcopal character and obligations. This reply was quite enough to give offence, and hence, it has been considered, the archbishop's name was omitted in making final arrangements for the committee.¹

§ 11. The presbyterian party had, indeed, evidently complete command over the general assembly, and as this body was more powerful than the executive, it would hear of no contradiction or control. Its encroaching spirit was conspicuously shown on the appointment of Patrick Adamson to the see of St. Andrew's. He was a divine of considerable attainments, born in Perth, and latterly minister at Paisley; whence he had been taken as chaplain into the family of the regent Morton. By him he was appointed, as the general assembly learnt in 1576, to the primacy. That body also found him unwilling to submit his qualifications to its scrutiny, and it took upon itself to inhibit the chapter from electing him.² Adamson now made use of artifice, professing himself without any intention of acting upon his nomination to the see. He thus amused the assembly until it separated, and then he was regularly elected. Eventually he made considerable concessions to the religious democracy that was uppermost; and, upon the whole, his conduct was very far from that of a straightforward, high-minded man. The constitution of his country was, however, in a sort of abeyance, and men are easily tempted to think artifice justifiable when law is driven to stand mute.

§ 12. Morton's hasty retirement from the regency was highly favourable to the continuation of this legal impotence. His abilities were making effectual progress towards a peaceful settlement of the national affairs; and by consequence it seemed likely to act injuriously, according to presbyterian views, upon the church.³ His intention evidently was to bridle Melville. He talked of him as led away by 'new opinions, and over-sea dreams,'⁴ alluding scornfully to the Genevan

¹ Collier, ii. 558. Dr. Russell does not say that Abp. Boyd was nominated on this committee originally; although he gives his reply.

² Heylin says that the chapter had already purposely delayed the election till the general assembly met. (*Hist. Presb.* 184.) The same author mentions the assembly's demand upon Adamson, as also do Collier and Russell. Dr. M'Crie does not mention this.

³ 'These revolutions in the political administration of the kingdom were so far favourable to the church. Had Morton's authority remained undisturbed, or had the adverse faction not felt the necessity of strengthening themselves against him, it is probable that force would have been employed to stop those ecclesiastical proceedings, to which both parties were equally averse.' M'Crie's *Melville*, i. 150.

⁴ *Ibid.* 146.

origin, as he and most others thought, of the ecclesiastical polity which was now so hotly pressed upon the country. But when a child under twelve years old nominally took the helm of state, this puppet sovereignty again unfettered all the energies of faction. The presbyterian party soon took advantage of the new facilities afforded for disregarding law. In April 1578, Melville being moderator of the general assembly, that body went so far as not only to abolish all episcopal titles, but also to inhibit chapters from electing new prelates, before its next meeting, under pain of perpetual deprivation.¹ Still the time might come when such illegal assumptions would be rendered powerless, if not penal, and some of the noblemen about the king were thought likely to be watching for the change. The assembly sought to discredit all these objects of suspicion by speaking of them as biassed by Romish predilections; and it insisted upon their subscription to the reformed creed, if they would remain free from spiritual censures. Without strong popular support, however, bold measures of this kind are very likely to miscarry, and the public mind requires constant stimulants to keep it long steadily active in pursuit of innovation. To refresh its slackening appetite for the new religious polity, a fast of a week was ordered by the assembly.² Thus the country generally could be made to ring with praises of the *Second Book of Discipline*, which was formally sanctioned by the general assembly in the same April. But the court, although very gracious in receiving it,³ showed no disposition to approve. Reasons for delay were immediately alleged, and a hope was expressed of some better adjustment of various embarrassing questions, before the royal authority should be given to so complete a subversion of the old ecclesiastical constitution.⁴ The assembly might be displeased by this hollow reception of its plans; it stood upon such commanding ground in a disorganised country that it would not modify them, or even rest contented without further advantages. When, accordingly, in July 1578, it met again, it changed its former suspension of capitular rights as to the election of bishops into a positive prohibition, ‘until the corruptions in the estate of bishops be wholly removed.’ A third meeting of the assembly in the October of this active year, summoned the archbishop of Glasgow, contumeliously styled commissioner for Kyle and Carrick, to submit himself to its authority, and lay aside the corruptions of his office. The prelate made a spirited reply, maintaining the lawfulness of his functions, appellation, and endowments; declaring himself resolved upon discharging all the duties, legally devolved upon him, to the best of his power; and yet admitting his full liability to the censure of the church if he should be proved a transgressor of those obligations which apostolical authority enjoins. He found, however, both himself and his brethren treated with so much indignity by the assembly, that he ceased from attending it: a line of conduct that all experience has proved to be injudicious.⁵ His

¹ Russell, i. 364.

² *Ibid.* 365.

³ M'Crie's *Melville*, i. 153.

⁴ Russell, i. 366.

⁵ *Ibid.* 369.

tormentors immediately saw their advantage. It is said that they nominated a commission, in which Melville, with singular indelicacy, if not ingratitude, allowed himself to be included, for the purpose of urging the archbishop to subscribe, under penalty of a process against him for contumacy.¹ His health had now decidedly given way, and while sinking into the grave, either weariness under importunity, or needless alarm, wrung from him the desired signature; a weakness that embittered his last moments. His brother-archbishop, Adamson of St. Andrew's, did not present himself at the assembly. That body, however, sent a deputation to him, demanding his complete submission; and, as if to leave an opening for new discoveries of objections to episcopacy, it was voted that the prelates must engage to undergo the reformation of any further corruptions detected in that institution. Powerless as was the court, it could not see such a never-ending series of illegal assumptions without trying a remonstrance at least. A royal letter was addressed to the assembly entreating its forbearance towards the ecclesiastical institutions established by law, while the king remained a minor, and the country unsettled. In receiving this communication, no respectful formalities were omitted, but the assembly, notwithstanding, renewed the commission against archbishop Adamson, and, as if to give the courtiers an intelligible hint, made urgent representations to check the growth of popery. Lay authorities, however, continued unwilling to legalise the assembly's encroachments. The crown was always ready for an excuse for delaying approval to the *Second Book of Discipline*; and the legislature, which met about the close of 1579, was found equally incompliant. It did, indeed, pass an act levelled at Romanism, forbidding any to go abroad for education without royal licence, and an engagement to remain steady Protestants. But even this was clogged with an unpalatable provision. The licenced traveller was to present himself, within twenty days of his return, to the bishop, superintendent, or commissioner, of the district, in which his residence was situated. Thus the presbyterian party had not only the mortification of seeing parliament evade its demands. Influential laymen were evidently also waiting for a suitable opportunity to re-model the ecclesiastical institutions of the country, and had no thought of their destruction.

§ 13. To render all such intentions hopeless, the clamour against popery was diligently kept up. Nor was it wholly groundless. The

¹ 'It is false that the commission to procure his subscription was entrusted to Melville, or to a committee of which he was one. David Weemes, minister of Glasgow, was the only individual employed in this business. (Cald. MS.) And two years elapsed between that transaction and the death of the bishop. The story of his being grieved on his death-bed at his renunciation of episcopacy is contradicted by what is immediately added: for Polwart, who is represented as his comforter, was a decided anti-episcopalian.'

(McCrie's *Melville*, i. 140.) Referring his reader to this passage, Dr. Russell says, 'He will do well, however, to consider, whether Calderwood, who is the biographer's chief authority, was likely to be better informed than Archbishop Spotswood, who lived at the period in question, and whose father was a superintendent and member of assembly. Calderwood was not born till the year 1575, and made most of his collections at a subsequent period in a foreign country.' i. 371.

Romanists naturally took the advantages gained by presbyterianism, from the national disorders, as a lesson to themselves, and began to come under public notice once more in various ways. But popularity had irrecoverably slipped from their grasp, and all their movements merely served to depress the reformed catholic party without benefiting themselves. Among injuries done to their credit at this time, one of the most serious came from the interception of dispensations, by which any degree of outward Protestant conformity that might be found expedient was allowed, provided that the parties kept their minds under strict allegiance to Rome.¹ To allay the heats excited by this discovery, a confession of faith was drawn up by royal authority, abjuring Romish peculiarities unreservedly, and containing a pledge to maintain the doctrine and constitution of the Scottish church. This formulary, being chiefly a series of disclaimers, became known as the *Negative Confession*. The king and his court subscribed it; but as they had not done this by the *Second Book of Discipline*, and as it might pass for an approval of bishops or superintendents, who were still legally established, little or nothing was gained towards tranquillising the public mind. Hence the general assembly, sitting at Dundee, was emboldened in July, 1580, to decree the extirpation of episcopacy. That institution was unanimously voted to be destitute of ‘any sure warrant, authority, or good ground out of Scripture, but brought in by the folly and corruption of men’s inventions, to the great overthrow of the kirk of God.’ Hence all present and future bishops were ordered to lay down their office at once, as a thing to which they have no calling by God. They were not even to be allowed to continue preaching, or any kind of religious ministration, until they should receive new powers from the general assembly.² Disobedience to this decree, or contravention of it in any point, was to be punished by excommunication, after due admonition given. Care was taken to shield these assumptions from silent contempt, by providing for the holding of synodal courts within the next month in all districts containing ‘usurped bishops,’ to which these functionaries were to be summoned. If they should refuse, warning was publicly to be given them from the pulpit by certain select members of the courts, holden within their several districts, to attend the next meeting of the general assembly, and hear the sentence of excommunication pronounced against them.³

§ 14. However painfully alive to its own impotence, the court could not regard such proceedings otherwise than as usurpations to be set aside on the first opportunity. Confidence was given to this intention by the feelings and even the conduct of many moderate men among the presbyterian party, who were filled with concern and uneasiness

¹ Collier speaks doubtfully of this alleged Romish offence, saying ‘These dispensations, whether genuine or forged.’ ii. 572.

² ‘Thus to proceed against the universal practice of the church for 1500 years, was

a hardy stroke, and peculiar to the courage of these assemblies.’ Collier, ii. 573.

³ ‘To this act, as the manuscript goes on, the bishop of Dunblain submitted himself.’ *Ibid.*

by the headlong assumptions of their friends. As the parliament, accordingly, which met after the violent votes at Dundee, had failed of lending any sanction to them, the crown naturally thought itself at liberty to exercise the powers with which it was constitutionally invested. Boyd's death, in June, 1581, had rendered the see of Glasgow vacant, and Robert Montgomery, minister of Stirling, was nominated in his place.¹ The general assembly, however, being backed by the populace, felt no more necessity than inclination to bow before this act of defiance. It sat in October 1581, and Montgomery's appointment was assailed by a storm of indignation. His acceptance of it was treated as a crime, for which he must answer to the assembly. A royal message stayed proceedings against him on this ground, but allowed his liability to answer for anything against his life or doctrine. Immediately Melville stood forward, and tendered an accusation of fifteen articles. This was referred to inferior judicatures, and, in the meanwhile, Montgomery was inhibited from leaving his ministry at Stirling, and from intruding into the see of Glasgow. The executive now showed a design of asserting its rights. The chapter of Glasgow was commanded to enter upon the election. It refused; and, in consequence, the privy council decided that the see had fallen into the king's sole nomination. Both parties now proceeded to extremities. The crown summoned the provincial synod which had taken cognisance of the accusations against Montgomery; imprisoned in the castle of Inverness those tenants of the see of Glasgow who withheld from him the rents of their several holdings, and expelled John Dury, Melville's friend, from Edinburgh as a preacher of sedition. On the other hand, the presbyterian party contested every point with the court, fulminated an excommunication against Montgomery, and drew up an indignant remonstrance upon the royal resistance lately made to its proceedings. This last was presented to the king at Perth, by a deputation from the general assembly. When the men chosen thus to defy the sovereign were admitted into his presence, the Earl of Arran, pointing to their credentials, asked, 'Who dares subscribe these treasonable articles?' 'We dare,' Melville replied, and, snatching a pen from the clerk, signed immediately: an example which he exhorted his brother delegates to follow, and they did so.²

¹ 'Montgomery, minister at Stirling, a man vain, fickle, presumptuous, and more apt, by the blemishes of his character, to have alienated the people from an order already beloved, than to reconcile them to one which was the object of their hatred, made an infamous simoniacal bargain with Lennox, and on his recommendation was chosen archbishop.' (Robertson, ii. 406.) 'Montgomery appears to have been a fickle and imprudent, rather than a bad man.' (Russell, ii. 5.) Certainly, the synodal decision against him, as given by Calderwood, is either vague, or turns upon disobedience to the religious democracy which was ille-

gally hunting him down. 'Damnant vitæ impuræ, doctrinæ corruptæ, suspensionis contemptæ, fidei violatæ, mendacii manifesti, disciplinæ infractæ, conviciorum in collegas pro concione, proscriptionis conventui interminatæ.' *Epist. Philad. Vind.* apud *Altare Damascenum*, 739.

² *Ibid.* 740. 'Certain Englishmen, who happened to be present, expressed their astonishment at the bold carriage of the ministers, and could scarcely be persuaded that they had not an armed force at hand to support them. Well they might be surprised; for more than forty years elapsed after that period before any of their country-

§ 15. The presbyterian party had, notwithstanding, reason for dissatisfaction with its prospects. Patrician zeal had cooled under the diminution of means to stimulate it from plunder of the church. Men of rank were now chiefly anxious for importance at the court and council-board; where manifestly was no intention of abandoning the ecclesiastical institutions immemorially established, and yet sanctioned by law. There was, however, a difficulty in their way, which the nobles found insurmountable, and therefore intolerable. The young boy upon the throne, whom they had pretended, for their own ends, to consider capable of ruling, fell completely into the hands of two favourites, Esmé Stuart, Duke of Lennox,¹ and James Stuart, Earl of Arran.² As no one else could see the least chance of moving the wires until the royal puppet should be finally severed from these two minions, a plan was concerted for seizing him. James had been in Athol hunting, and on his return to Edinburgh, with but few attendants, he received an invitation to Ruthven castle, from its owner, the Earl of Gowry, lately Lord Ruthven.³ This seeming courtesy was accepted with great pleasure, because the young monarch expected from it further sport. When he came, however, within the castle, he found it fuller than he expected, or quite liked; and his uneasiness was increased by several arrivals afterwards. The evening passed off with every appearance of a desire to gratify him, and he, on his part, carefully dissembled his apprehensions. Next morning he was dressed for the chace, intending to watch his opportunity and ride away. But he was not suffered even to leave his chamber. The nobles entered, and presented a strong remonstrance against his favourites, who were branded as enemies to the religion and liberties of Scotland. James yet thought of dissimulation. He was very courteous, though evidently somewhat impatient. Having kept up appearances, as it seemed long enough, he made for the door. Instantly the Master of Glamis stepped forward and stopped his egress. The king expostulated, entreated, threatened, but all in vain, and he burst into tears. ‘No matter,’ Glamis said; ‘better bairns weep than bearded men:’ an obvious truth, but one which few boys could endure, and James was not in that narrow and wise minority.⁴ He was now kept a close prisoner, but treated with every appearance of

men were able to meet the frowns of an arbitrary court with such firmness and intrepidity.’ (McCrie’s *Melville*, i. 184.) It might, undoubtedly, be ‘more than forty years’ before the English executive became sufficiently contemptible to make way for the civil war.

¹ Son of a younger brother of the Earl of Lennox. He was born in France, and bore the title of Lord d’Aubigné, from an estate in that country conferred upon his family for services rendered to the French crown. He arrived in Scotland in 1579, under colour of claiming some of his ancestral estates, but it seems really as an agent of the French government, which was then

intent upon a scheme for associating James upon the throne with his mother. He was created a baron immediately, and then successively earl and duke of Lennox. He became a protestant soon after his arrival in Scotland, and at his death, which took place in Paris, within a few months of his expulsion from that country, he professed himself one.

² Second son of Lord Ochiltree. He seems to have been a dissipated worthless person.

³ August, 1582.

⁴ ‘Which words entered so deeply into the king’s heart, as he did never forget them.’ Spotswood, 320.

respect. Lennox and Arran made separate attempts for his deliverance, but unsuccessfully; and the former was driven from Scotland, the latter was confined to the castle of Stirling.¹ The *Raid of Ruthven*, as this enterprise was called, proved highly advantageous to the presbyterian party. The noble conspirators knew their hopes of retaining the advantages that they had seized to depend upon popular support, which itself depended upon their old but lately-neglected allies, the ministers. Having first, accordingly, extorted a proclamation from the captive prince, approving of the *Raid*, as a patriotic enterprise, they went to Edinburgh, gratified the people there by recalling Dury, and obtained an order from the general assembly to have their undertaking commended from every pulpit in the country as 'a good and acceptable service to God, the sovereign, and the country.'² By this extravagant concession, the presbyterian party regained its old ascendancy over the nobility. But it naturally made itself more odious than ever to James. He could hardly fail, even in riper age, of looking with disgust upon a system which, for its own aggrandisement, had authoritatively prostituted preaching to justify an outrage, purely political, perpetrated upon himself.

§ 16. The *Raid of Ruthven* proved highly acceptable to queen Elizabeth, as the conspirators, probably, were well aware beforehand that it would prove. She saw the influence of Lennox to be subversive of her policy, and likely to bring about all the old influence of France over Scotland. On the other hand, the French court felt severely disappointed, and its ambassador to England received instructions to go into Scotland for the purpose of endeavouring to place James in a situation of greater dignity and comfort. Elizabeth could not, with any decency, refuse permission for this diplomatic visit to the northern capital, but she took precautions to defeat its real object, by sending Davison as a nominal attendant upon the ambassador, but really to act as a spy, and to keep up the spirits of the party then dominant in Scotland. Both objects were completely gained. James, indeed, was delighted with the French ambassador, but not at all bettered by his visit.³ The preachers were all up in arms, and when assailed by the king's request to refrain from topics offensive to the distinguished stranger, they expressed a determination to be guided only by a sense of duty, and warned their sovereign against bad examples, and popish agents. Their strength was even displayed in a studious insult to the embassy. James wished an entertainment to be given it by the city of Edinburgh, and, in spite of clerical opposition, the banquet was prepared. A solemn fast was then ordered on that very day, to pacify heaven under the court's pernicious tendency towards popery.⁴

¹ Robertson, ii. 412.

² Ibid. 414.

³ Ibid. 417.

⁴ Collier, ii. 578. 'To impede this feast, the ministers did on the Sunday preceding, proclaim a fast to be kept on the same day on which the feast was appointed; and to

detain the people at church, the three ordinary preachers did, one after the other, make a sermon in St. Giles' church, without any intermission of time, thundering curses against the magistrates, and other noblemen that waited on the ambassadors by the king's direction. Nor stayed their folly

§ 17. The presbyterian party was indeed so elated by its absolute mastery over James, that it indulged in the wildest expectations. The general assembly required a legislative act for placing all statutes relating to the church upon such a footing as that none should have the power of abrogating them without its own consent, or of interfering to silence ministers, judge of doctrine, or hinder discipline.¹ Parliament would not, however, agree to this plan of establishing a papal democracy. Other schemes for subverting the old ecclesiastical constitution of Scotland were foiled chiefly by the dexterity of Adamson, the primate, who contrived various measures to protract and perplex.² In the meanwhile, James was intent only upon regaining his liberty, and young as he was, being a considerable adept at dissimulation, his captors were thrown off their guard. Colonel Stewart, commander of the troop that held him in custody, he gained, and he was then allowed to leave Falkland for St. Andrew's, under pretence of visiting his grand-uncle, the Earl of March.³ When arrived at that ancient city, he took up his quarters in an open, defenceless house, just as if he had no thought of anything but of enjoying his holiday. He expressed, however, some curiosity to see the castle, and a sufficient escort being provided, it was agreed to indulge him. Having entered the castle with a few whom he could trust, Stewart ordered the gates to be shut upon all the rest of the escort. Intelligence was immediately conveyed to the nobles opposed to the Ruthven party, and on the next morning, they appeared in such force, that James was irrecoverably gone from his late captors. He now issued a proclamation disavowing his former approval of the *Raid*, as an act extorted from him while he was not a free agent. Falling now, at first, into very able hands, he pardoned his captors, and made the fairest promises. He was not, however, long at liberty before he became anxious for a visit from his worthless favourite, Arran, promising that it should only last a single day. The courtiers did all in their power to save him from this temptation; but in vain. Arran came, and James forgot his promise. The Ruthven conspirators were now called upon for an abject acknowledgment of their offence, being promised in return a full pardon, unless future misconduct should render them unworthy of the royal clemency. None would accept of such a pardon, and all, accordingly, were ordered, by a new proclamation, to surrender themselves. Some of them now fled into England, others, under a royal licence, withdrew to the continent. Gowry at length submitted, but finding himself equally odious to both parties, he was easily persuaded into a new conspiracy. Two days

there, but the ambassadors being gone, they pursued the magistrates with the censures of the church, and were with difficulty enough stayed from proceeding with excommunication against them, for not observing the fast they proclaimed.' (Spotswood, 324.) One of these French ambassadors, La Motte, came in for an especial share of pulpit denunciation. The white cross, which

he wore upon his shoulder as a knight of the order of *St. Esprit*, was pronounced a badge of *Antichrist*, and he was himself described as the ambassador of the bloody murderer; they meant, of the duke of Guise.

¹ Russell, ii. 13.

² Robertson, ii. 424.

³ June, 1583.

before this occasioned any overt act, he was arrested at Dundee, where he had been staying rather longer than seemed reasonable, for the ostensible purpose of passing into France, and being convicted of treason, he was beheaded at Stirling. His accomplices had no sooner appeared in arms, than such a royal force advanced as rendered success impossible. On this they hastily fled into England, leaving by their discomfiture the government of James far stronger than it had ever been before.¹

§ 18. Even before the bursting out of this abortive conspiracy, James had endeavoured successfully to curb the pulpit. In the autumn after his escape, Dury, the celebrated Edinburgh minister, preached in justification of the *Raid*. For this he was brought before the council, and assumed at first a very bold front. Eventually he somewhat mitigated his tone, and was left without further molestation.² In the following February, Melville was called before the privy council at Edinburgh, to answer for seditious and treasonable language, uttered by him in the pulpit, on a fast-day in the preceding month.³ He defended himself with his usual spirit, and insisted upon a right, as a minister of religion, to decline the judgment of civil authorities upon his doctrine, until it should first have been condemned by the church.⁴ This plea being disregarded, and

¹ Robertson, ii. 428.

² 'He was kept for some time on his good behaviour.' Collier, ii. 589.

³ He received the summons to appear on the following Monday, on Sat., Feb. 15, 1584. (M'Crie's *Melville*, i. 197.) The charge arose out of a sermon upon Daniel's reproof to Belshazzar (Dan. v. 18, *et seq.*), in which he is reminded of Nebuchadnezzar's misfortunes from the neglect of sound principles. Melville added, 'But now-a-days, if a minister should rehearse the example that fell out in King James the Third's days, who was abused by the flattery of his courtiers, he would be said to wander from his text, and perchance be accused of treason.' (M'Crie, *ut supra*.) Calderwood makes this rather more offensive, by applying as Melville's, *that sort of cattle to court flatterers*, 'ut rex sibi ab hoc genere pecudum caveat.' Epist. Philad. Vind. *Altare Damascenum*, 741.

⁴ He 'was so hardy as to affirm, *that what was delivered in the pulpit, ought first to be tried by the presbytery; and that, though the expressions were treasonable, neither king nor council ought to take cognizance of them in the first instance.*' (Collier, ii. 589.) 'All that they (the Presbyterians) insisted for was, that when a minister was accused of having exceeded the proper bounds of his office, and of having taught from the pulpit what tended to the hurt of the state, or the dishonour of magistrates, instead of being immediately dragged before a civil tribunal, the accusation against

him should be brought, *in the first instance*, before those courts which had the direct oversight of his pastoral conduct. If they should find the accusation well-founded, it was incumbent on them to censure him for a violation of his ministerial duty, and to leave him to the judgment of the proper court for the civil offence of which he had been guilty. Or, if they, through the influence of undue partiality, should justify him erroneously, it was still competent for the civil magistrate to proceed against him in the exercise of that authority which the antecedent judgment of the church could neither supersede nor invalidate.' (M'Crie, 209.) 'At the period of which we speak, the pulpit was, in fact, the only organ by which public opinion was, or could be, expressed; and the ecclesiastical courts were the only assemblies in the nation which possessed anything that was entitled to the name of liberty or independence. Parliament had its business prepared to its hand, and laid before it in the shape of acts which required only its assent. Discussion and freedom of speech were unknown to its meetings. The courts of justice were dependent on the will of the sovereign, and frequently had their proceedings regulated, and their decisions dictated by letters and messages from the throne. It was the preachers who first taught the people to express an opinion on public affairs and the conduct of their rulers; and the assemblies of the church set the earliest example of a regular and firm opposition to the arbi-

his manner of urging it being pronounced an insult, he was condemned to imprisonment, and a fine at the king's discretion. He saved himself by a flight into England; but his *declinature*, as the phrase runs, became a precedent of considerable importance, and yet affords matter for literary controversy. Presbyterian writers consider it as involving a principle which ministers cannot conscientiously surrender. Episcopalians, on the other hand, identify it with some of the most offensive papal assumptions, and urge its obvious tendency, when parties run high, and turn considerably upon religion, to render the pulpit little else than a powerful weapon of political strife.

§ 19. The suppression of that conspiracy in which Gowry was implicated, immediately following, the government found courage enough to grapple manfully with its difficulties. A parliament, which sate in May, 1584, made it treason to decline the jurisdiction of the king in council. The same liability was to come from impugning the power and authority of any of the three estates of parliament, or from seeking to diminish their privileges. This ranged all the attempts which had been made for a series of years to abolish episcopacy, under the head of treasons. Another act rendered nugatory all judgments and jurisdictions, whether spiritual or temporal, which had hitherto been exercised without parliamentary authority; and prohibited all assemblies, except the ordinary courts, for any matter of state, either civil or ecclesiastical, without special licence of the crown. This was intended for the suppression of those general assemblies, and local presbyteries, which had sprung up of late years without any constitutional warrant, and which had proved stronger for every purpose, but for the command of pecuniary resources, than any other power within the state. Another act provided for the issue of commissions to the bishops and others to be associated with them, for the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs within their several dioceses. Another act rendered it penal to slander the king and royal family, or even to hear this done and not reveal it. These were stigmatised as the *black acts* by the presbyterian party; and it is obvious, that had the throne been occupied by an able man with steady support, instead of a raw lad, whose capacity, even when mature, is doubtful, and whose power was like a March gleam, the religious democracy, so long rampant, would have been effectually crippled, and placed in a way for final extinction. Some of the provisions in these acts, undoubtedly, savour of an arbitrary spirit, but their general tenour is unexceptionable. The

trary and unconstitutional measures of the court.' (*Ibid.* 214.) Undoubtedly, the Scottish pulpit in those days answered the ends of party-newspapers in these; but although there might be no other means of answering such ends, a provision for them was very much out of place in churches. As for the terms 'arbitrary and unconstitutional,' they really applied to the kirk assemblies, at least as much as to the court.

These bodies were most intolerant of all opinions but their own, and highly oppressive of the prelates, notwithstanding their legal immunity from any such jurisdiction. They were, besides, essentially usurping bodies, being as yet unrecognised by the constitution. Upon the whole, those who draw a parallel between the papal and the presbyterian assumptions of that day have a very fair case to deal with.

regular meetings and assumed privileges of a body, like the general assembly, unknown to the constitution, were a species of usurpation which no executive is justified in tolerating, except under the pressure of necessity. The ancient episcopal polity had never been legally abrogated, and until this was done, another system, sprung up, as it were yesterday, amidst protracted national convulsions, had no right whatever to thrust it aside, and insist upon occupying its place. The usurping party was, however, naturally slow to discern this obvious truth, and was likely to view the parliamentary vindication of constitutional rights, as a pernicious infringement of Gospel privileges. Some of the ministers, accordingly, repaired to the parliament-house, for the sake of protesting against these statutes. But the doors were shut against them.¹ Orders were also given to drag from the pulpit any who should make it a place for inflaming the populace against the legislature's recent unanimous votes. Three of the Edinburgh ministers did, however, notwithstanding, make such a show of opposition as lay in their power. When the acts were proclaimed at the Market-cross, according to immemorial usage, they repaired thither, and uttered with all due formality a public protestation against them.² Orders were immediately given for the apprehension of these bold opponents. But they were not to be found. A timely flight into England saved them for future opportunities of embarrassing or defying their own government; and more than twenty of their brethren quickly followed their example.

§ 20. To the great mass who remained, a subscription to the recent acts of parliament, and an acknowledgment of episcopal superiority, were promptly offered. Such as refused were to be deprived of their benefices, or scholastic or university appointments, and to be rendered incapable of holding them hereafter. Compliance was at first very generally refused; but in the end a great number subscribed, becoming either convinced of the reasonableness of the act, or intimidated by the prospect of destitution, or beguiled by a dexterous evasion which the primate, Adamson, allowed them to use.³ James thus

¹ 'Though eversive of all liberty, civil and natural, as well as ecclesiastical, not a nobleman, baron, or burghess, ventured to open his mouth against them.' Mc'Crie's *Melville*, i. 224.

² 'These new statutes were calculated to render churchmen as inconsiderable as they were indigent; and as the avarice of the nobles had stripped them of the wealth, the king's ambition was about to deprive them of the power, which once belonged to their order. No wonder the alarm was universal, and the complaints loud.' Robertson, ii. 430.

³ 'It would appear that the statutes, passed in the parliament of 1584, however offensive to the more ardent among the ministers, had obtained the approbation of a considerable number of their body, who were more disposed for peace. Spotswood

relates, *that a motion was made in the assembly (1586) for censuring the ministers that had allowed the acts concluded in the parliament, 1584, by their subscriptions; but they were found to be so many as it was feared the urging thereof would breed a schism and division in the church: wherefore, after some altercation, the matter was left, and all the ministers exhorted to judge charitably one of another; notwithstanding their diversity of opinion.*' (Russell, ii. 17.) 'Perceiving that the greater part of the ministers were not to be terrified into compliance, Adamson artfully divided them, by introducing into the bond one of those ambiguous and unmeaning clauses which serve only to blind the simple, and to save the consciences of those who are anxious to escape from trouble. After having made a manful resistance, Craig suffered himself to be caught by this

found himself placed in a far more promising situation than had greeted any holder of the Scottish sovereignty during many years. As a necessary consequence, Elizabeth felt some apprehensions of losing her long-established influence over his dominions. She now, accordingly, applied herself to the gaining of his favourite, Arran, and in this object her success was immediate. He, on the other hand, having secured an interest with the southern queen, obtained parliamentary attainders, in August 1584, against a great number of the exiles, and gratified his party with their estates, taking, of course, a noble portion for himself. This unwonted wealth, however, only increased the minion's insolence, and made him more odious to the nation. Hence Elizabeth found herself with little power over Scotland, except at court, where, she well knew, nothing was to be depended upon. She now, therefore, decided upon the ruin of Arran, and her skilful agents were not long in effecting it. James had been captivated by a new favourite, the master of Gray, and by his means English influence was again established over the Scottish people. The banished lords had been allowed to approach the borders, when Arran, who was again coming into favour, urged the necessity of exertion to prevent them from crossing. His rival, Gray, impeded the preparations, and the exiles were soon in Scotland, so supported as to render their expulsion hopeless. James immediately fell into their hands, and Arran, stripped of wealth and title, was thrust into despised obscurity.

§ 21. The ministers, who returned in the rear of the banished lords, naturally looked for some substantial benefits from their restoration. But, as usual, they were disappointed. Their noble friends, anxious only for their own interests, were bent upon conciliating the king, and he would not surrender the nation's ecclesiastical institutions. The preachers, deeply mortified by this new proof of their impotence upon pecuniary questions, broke out again in their old style of preaching;¹ greatly to the displeasure of James, and very little to the benefit of their own influence over moderate men. The court was evidently resolved upon reducing them to insignificance, if possible. It had been the practice of the general assembly to meet a little earlier than

snare, and drew into it the greater part of his brethren. Even the honest and intrepid Dury is said to have become a subscriber, and thus to have lent his hand to build again the things which he was among the foremost to destroy. And Erskine of Dun, whose character stood so high, and who had formerly made so honourable a stand for the liberties of the church, not only became a conformist himself, but was extremely active in persuading others to conform.' (M'Crie's *Melville*, i. 226.) 'They promised to obey *according to the word of God*. James Melville, who wrote a long letter intended to expose the evil of the bond, characterises this qualifying clause as *manifestam repugnantiam in adjecto*, as if one should say, *he*

would obey the pope and his prelates, according to the word of God.' (*Ib.* note.) Calderwood's view of this clause is more judicious. 'Cum subjicere se spirituali jurisdictioni episcoporum *secundum verbum Dei* nihil aliud sit, quam agnoscere episcopos habere jurisdictionem spirituales, sed non parendum esse iis, si quid imperaverint quod cum Dei verbo non est consentaneum.' Epist. Philadelph. Vind. *Altare Damascenum*, 743.

¹ 'The ministers gave vent to their indignation in the pulpit, and their impatience under the disappointment broke out in some expressions extremely disrespectful even towards the king himself.' Robertson, iii. 29.

parliament, under the plea of preparing such petitions, or other memorials, as it might be necessary to offer for legislative consideration. The estates, accordingly, being summoned to Linlithgow, in December, 1585, an extraordinary meeting of the general assembly was called at Dunfermline, towards the close of November. When the members, however, approached, admittance into the town was refused, royal orders for that purpose having been served upon the provost. They then met in the fields, and adjourned to Linlithgow, a few days before parliament was to assemble. Great exertions were made in the intervening time to arouse all the energies of presbyterian party spirit. But while the more active of that party had been fugitives in England, others had remained at home, and even given their adhesion there to the measures of government. Some of these latter felt aggrieved by the agitating exertions of their more violent friends, and one of them answered a pulpit attack in the same way, by preaching before parliament, against the *peregrine ministers*, as he styled those who had recently returned from England. Nothing is more offensive to men who seek their own ends by inflaming popular passions, than the use of this weapon by opponents. A great ferment accordingly arose from this employment of pulpit stimulants on the royal side, and the more sagacious presbyterians were well aware, that unless it could be promptly allayed, their own would be the cause to suffer. Hence exertions were made, and with success, to obtain the postponement of their disputes from those most prominent in the strife. After this accommodation, the ministers made urgent appeals to their noble friends. But nothing could be heard more satisfactory than expressions of regret upon the hopelessness of their views from the settled repugnance of the king. They then sought an interview with James, and much passed on both sides, little suitable to the dignity of either. The ministers wanted a suspension of the *black acts* until another parliament, liberty of holding their ecclesiastical assemblies, the reduction of episcopacy to the same state that it had been in before the late enactments, and the restoration to their places and emoluments of all ministers and masters of colleges who had been recently deprived. The last concession was the only one that could be gained.¹

§ 22. James was, however, too young, perhaps also too weak, both in position and understanding, for the resolute occupation of the constitutional ground which he had taken. One of his first measures, after the parliamentary disregard of presbytery, was an endeavour to conciliate its friends by some sort of compromise. In February, 1586, a conference was arranged between a section of the privy council and certain of the ministers, chosen from an opinion of their superior moderation. These divines being asked, whether they would allow a pre-eminence to bishops in respect of order, though not of jurisdiction, answered, that none such 'could stand with God's word,' but they admitted themselves able to endure it, in case it should be forced upon

¹ M'Crie's *Melville*, i. 250.

them. After several discussions, it was agreed that bishops should remain, and should preside over the presbyteries in which they officiated, being subject to trial and censure by the general assembly only, or by commissioners whom it should specially appoint. This qualified concession was, however, more than neutralised by the accompaniment of the king's consent to some of the leading articles in the *Second Book of Discipline*. James allowed presbyteries to be re-established, and recognised the powers of general and other assemblies. The whole negotiation was, therefore, favourable to presbytery in spite of some qualified concessions to the episcopal party. Melville and his friends, accordingly, were nothing daunted, either by their parliamentary failure at the beginning of winter, or by this negotiation at its end. In the spring, James Melville made an indecent attack from the pulpit upon Adamson, the primate, who was present; and when this was resented, the synod of Fife supported it by an excommunication. It would have been wise, perhaps, to suffer this impotent indignity in silence; but Adamson thought otherwise, and met it by a counter-excommunication.¹

§ 23. As, after all the various assaults that it had undergone, the framework of the church still remained, a competent executive might at last prove too much for presbyterianism. James was now grown a man, and might acquire considerable power. But he was beset by the poverty which had immemorably crippled his family, and a rash habit of profusion rendered him likely to feel this difficulty rather severely. It was, therefore, found an easy matter to persuade him into the annexation, to the crown, of ecclesiastical property, yet unappropriated, reserving tithes, and mansion houses occupied by clerical persons. He was assured that a sufficient provision would thus be made both for the episcopal order and the inferior clergy. His artful advisers were apparently willing to preserve bishops; their mansion houses, and the tithes appropriated to the different sees, being left undisturbed: while, at the same time, the royal exchequer seemed likely to receive a seasonable and a permanent supply. Their objects really were to obtain good titles for their own irregular acquisitions from the church, and to strip bishoprics in such a manner as to render it undesirable, and, indeed, hardly possible, to accept them. James was, however, too young for discerning the drift and operation of the plan. He consented, accordingly, to the *Act of Annexion*, which passed in Parliament in July 1587. He soon saw himself merely to have fallen into

¹ M'Crie's *Melville*, i. 272. 'Without denying that Adamson merited the censure inflicted on him, I cannot help thinking that the procedure of the synod was precipitant and irregular. The manner in which James Melville introduced the affair was certainly a material pre-judgment of the cause, and there is reason to think that his uncle was not a stranger beforehand to his intentions.' (M'Crie's *Melville*, i. 273.) The archbishop was charged principally with devising the acts of 1584 (*the black acts*)

against the kirk and the liberties thereof. He denied this, but allowed himself to have approved those acts. The synod, if such it may be called, consisted partly of the neighbouring gentry, and others not in orders. Dr. M'Crie admits, 'It is probable that the general odium under which Adamson lay at this time among the principal gentlemen of Fife, pushed on the synod to the adoption of such hasty and decisive measures.' *Ut supra*.

a snare, spoke of the statute as a *vile and pernicious act*, and advised his successor to annul it on the first opportunity.¹ Until it passed, an uncertainty constantly hung over the fortunes which had latterly been gained from the church; but all hope of recovering any part of them for public uses was henceforth gone, and a skilful use of the titles, so loosely confirmed, made a large portion even of the non-monastic tithe property permanently swell the rent-rolls of private families. Thus the ministers, as usual, were balked, and farmers complained of a strictness in collecting dues, lately ecclesiastical, to which they had not been used.² The king found his hopes of increased wealth little better than delusion. So much ecclesiastical property had already been alienated, that very little remained; and of that little, hungry courtiers, regularly at work upon a young man unusually open to importunity, soon gained a very large proportion. To the episcopal order, however, the blow did all that lasting injury which the presbyterians intended when they struck it.³

§ 24. Another act, passed by the Parliament of 1587, although with no ecclesiastical view, soon operated powerfully upon the church. Constitutionally, every freeholder, or immediate vassal of the crown, was a member of the legislature. Anciently, the number of such tenants was not very large, but in course of time extensive properties became, by various accidents, widely subdivided, and legislative privileges thus descended to a numerous class, commonly far from opulent. By such persons parliamentary attendance was found burdensome; and hence it was usually declined by all but the greater barons. A powerful nobility, unchecked by inferior stations, is, however, usually an over-match for the sovereign. James I. was, therefore, induced, in 1427, to procure an act by which the lesser barons, or yeoman gentry, were formally excused from personal presence in Parliament, and empowered to elect two members from each county as their representatives. Even this mitigated call upon the smaller proprietors was, in process of time, very imperfectly obeyed. Unless under some very extraordinary excitement, none but the greater barons would encounter the expense of a legislative session. The crown had been ordinarily protected from suffering materially by this apathy, because the prelacy supplied about fifty members to the legislature,⁴ and these were a standing refuge against patrician encroachments. But the reformation acted most injuriously upon this dependence. It is true, that even monastic prelates yet retained seats in Parliament. The abbot, or prior, had, however, become usually no other than some lay gentleman, irregularly possessed of an ecclesiastical barony, and claiming the same legislative rights that had been vested in the former professional owner of the property. Thus the monastic divi-

¹ 'In his book called *Basilicon Doron*.' Heylin's *Hist. Presb.* 292.

² *Ibid.* Heylin says that these seizures of tithes, unappropriated to religious houses, originated under the regency of Murray, whose weakness ensured connivance.

³ 'After a step so fatal to the power and

wealth of the dignified clergy, it was no difficult matter to introduce that change in the government of the church, which soon after took place.' Robertson, iii. 77.

⁴ Calderwood, *Epist. Philadelph. Vind. Altare Damascenum*, 748.

sion of the first parliamentary estate had, in fact, merged in the lay peerage. Nor was the episcopal division even exclusively composed of ecclesiastics with regular credentials, or had it sufficiently escaped pillage to be thoroughly respectable, or even independent: and it had besides been made so systematically, during many years, the butt of popular scorn and abuse, that it felt paralysed, and was become, for legislative purposes, nearly useless. Thus the crown really found Parliament little else than an assembly of nobles, whom, when there was a moderate share of unanimity among them, it had no prospect of controlling. To remedy this evil, James now procured a revival of the statute of 1427, much to the dissatisfaction of many among the greater barons, who clearly foresaw the injurious effect of such a change upon the power of their own order. From that time, accordingly, county members, or commissioners of shires, as they were called, regularly came to Parliament,¹ and as they were extensively leavened with a democratic spirit, presbyterianism owed much to their votes.²

§ 25. Various circumstances gradually prepared the king also for concession. Philip of Spain, and the more zealous Romanists, were intent upon the overthrow of British Protestantism by military violence. The famous *Armada* was to strike the irresistible blow; but a way was to be paved for its earlier success, and for the complete restoration of Britain to Roman trammels, by the previous activity of ecclesiastical agents. Jesuits, and other papal emissaries, accordingly, were now insinuating themselves, and instilling their doctrines in every corner, not only of England, but also of Scotland. Some of the Scottish nobility were won over by their arts, and a general apprehension of popery began to prevail in most parts of the country. This was not even removed by the destruction of the *Armada*. Spain now meditated an invasion of England through Scotland; considering it easy to make a descent upon the latter kingdom, and reckoning upon the numerous Romish families seated in the northern counties of her southern neighbour.³ While such a vision was afloat, the papal party naturally continued its activity, and James often found this embarrassing. He was thus naturally driven to desire the union of the Protestant body. The chancellor, Maitland, who had now great weight with him, took advantage of his uneasiness to remove prejudices against the presbyterian party.⁴ He pleaded its cause with the greater success from the improving manners of Edinburgh, in which Bruce, a popular preacher of family, talent, and severe virtue, had gained an immense influence.⁵ The king was likewise diverted from his former attention to ecclesiastical questions by matrimony, and its preliminaries. He had made overtures to the king of Denmark's eldest daughter, and, after some suspense, was disappointed. He then did the same by her youngest sister, and that princess was actually on her way to espouse him, when a violent storm drove her back to Norway, and no hopes were given of her sailing again until the

¹ Robertson, iii. 79.

² Russell, ii. 26.

³ Robertson, iii. 87.

⁴ Maitland had originally been of the episcopal party. M'Crie's *Melville*, i. 298.

⁵ *Ibid.* 299.

following spring. Impatient of this delay, James himself determined hastily upon crossing the ocean, and safely effected it. But it was thought dangerous to attempt a return before spring, and the royal bridegroom spent several months at Copenhagen, in that round of feasting and jollity which he enjoyed at all times, above most men. On returning after this long respite from the conflicting claims of episcopacy and presbyterianism, he found Edinburgh to have passed a winter of unwonted order and tranquillity.¹ Well knowing the great authority and unbending integrity of Bruce, he had nominated him, on his departure, an extraordinary member of the privy council, saying that he reckoned upon him rather than upon any other to preserve the public peace. As his expectations were more than realised, he could hardly fail of growing into better humour with presbyterianism. The preacher to whom, in his absence, he had been so much obliged, was now complimented by a call to crown the queen.² Thus James was placed, for the first time in his life, upon the best of terms with his presbyterian subjects. His fits of good humour generally found a vent in hasty speeches; and he made one to the general assembly soon after his return from Denmark,³ which has figured in books ever since, and which, no doubt, he often thought of with no little mortification during all the latter years of his life. 'I praise God,' said he, 'that I was born in such a time, as in the time of the light of the Gospel; to such a place, as to be king of such a kirk, the sincerest⁴ kirk of the world. The kirk of Geneva keep Pasch⁵ and Yule.⁶ What have they for them?

¹ 'Scarcely one affray happened in which blood was shed, although formerly a week seldom elapsed without instances of such violations of the peace and insults on legal authority.' (M'Crie's *Melville*, i. 300.) This account of Scottish society as then existing, even in the capital, is an obvious clue to much of the difficulty encountered by the government.

² May 17, 1590, in the chapel of Holyrood house. 'None of the bishops being at hand, the king was willing to embrace the opportunity to oblige the kirk, by making choice of one of their own brethren to perform the ceremony; to which he nominated Mr. Robert Bruce, a preacher at Edinburgh, and one of the most moderate men in the whole assembly. But when the fitness of it came to be examined by the rest of the brethren, it was resolved to pre-empt the unction (or anointing of her) as a Jewish ceremony, abolished by Christ, restored into Christian kingdoms by the pope's authority, and therefore not to be continued in a church reformed. The doubt was first started by one John Davinsson; who had then no charge in the church, though followed by a company of ignorant and seditious people, whom Andrew Melvin set on work to begin the quarrel, and then stood up in his defence to make it good.

Much pains was taken to convince them by the word of God, that the unction, or anointing of kings, was no Jewish ceremony: but Melvin's will was neither to be ruled by reason, nor subdued by argument, and he had there so strong a party that it passed in the negative. In so much that Bruce durst not proceed in the solemnity, for fear of the censures of the kirk. The king had notice of it, and returns this word, that if the coronation might not be performed by Bruce with the wonted ceremonies, he would stay till the coming of the bishops, of whose readiness to conform therein, he could make no question. Rather than so, said Andrew Melvin, let the unction pass: better it was that a minister should perform that honourable office in what form soever, than that the bishops should be brought again unto the court upon that occasion. But yet, unwilling to profane himself by consenting to it, he left them to agree about it as to them seemed best, and he being gone, it was concluded by the major part of the voices that the anointing should be used.' Heylin's *Hist. Presb.* 294.

³ August, 1590.

⁴ Purest.

⁵ Easter.

⁶ Christmas.

They have no institution. As for our neighbour-kirk in England, their service is an evil-said mass in English. They want nothing of the mass but the liftings.¹ I charge you, my good people, ministers, doctors, elders, nobles, gentlemen, and barons, to stand to your purity, and to exhort the people to do the same: and I, forsooth, so long as I brook² my life and crown, shall maintain the same against all deadly.³

§ 26. James was kept in this temper for conciliating presbytery, both by the perseverance of its friends, and the urgency of his own affairs. He followed up his eulogy upon it by permitting the assembly to frame such acts as gradually removed episcopal authority. He suffered Adamson, the primate, to sink unaided under a most vindictive and unfeeling persecution.⁴ That prelate had, by his own order,⁵ officiated at the Earl of Huntly's marriage, without requiring assent from him to the confession of faith according to presbyterian usage, but which the noble bridegroom, being really a confirmed Romanist, excused himself from signing.⁶ For this omission, aggravated by some other charges, the archbishop was pronounced, by the presbytery of Edinburgh, to have incurred the forfeiture of his preferment;⁷

¹ Elevation of the consecrated wafer.

² Enjoy.

³ 'Whether James was seized, on this occasion, with a sudden fit of devotion and of affection for his mother-church, or whether he merely adopted this language to gain the favour of the ministers, may admit of some doubt. But it is certain, that the speech was received by the assembly with a transport of joy: *there was nothing heard for a quarter of an hour, but praising God and praying for the king.*' (M'Crie's *Melville*, i. 304.) 'Even admitting the authenticity of this celebrated piece of declamation, it is manifest, that his majesty, young as he was, did not commit himself on the point of church government. He praised the doctrines taught in his native communion, and the care with which every approach to Romish superstition had been avoided. As to the *polity*, however, he uniformly declared, that, in his estimation, it was not free from many defects.' Russell, ii. 35.

⁴ 'Adamson was the only one of the bishops who persisted in opposing the church, after the annexation of their temporalities to the crown.' M'Crie's *Melville*, i. 312.

⁵ Russell, ii. 29.

⁶ 'Huntly was the chief of the popish party in Scotland, and deeply engaged in a treasonable correspondence with Spain. His proposed marriage with a ward of the crown, the daughter of the Duke of Lennox, his majesty's favourite, was, for obvious reasons, dreaded by all the Protestants. To accomplish this object the more easily, Huntly

feigned, as he afterwards acknowledged, a disposition to renounce the catholic faith, but affected to stickle at some of the Protestant doctrines. The presbytery of Edinburgh, believing that his object was to drive time, prohibited any of the ministers to celebrate the marriage until he had subscribed the confession. Notwithstanding this, Adamson performed the ceremony, at the very time that the Spanish *Armada* was expected to appear on the coast of England.' (M'Crie's *Melville*, i. 313.) Now, whether or not, Huntly might be a very dangerous man, and his proposed marriage a very improper one, the question will still remain as to whether Adamson was not justified in obeying his sovereign, who had legal rights, rather than the presbytery of Edinburgh, which really had none, although it claimed and actually exercised such. The *Armada* year was 1588, the year in which Scottish presbytery gained a legal establishment was 1592.

⁷ 'He was charged with having abstracted, secreted, and mutilated the registers of the assembly, and with having celebrated the marriage of the Earl of Huntly, contrary to an express inhibition of the commissioners of the church. The assembly remitted his trial to the presbytery of Edinburgh, giving them full power to pass a final sentence in the process according to the laws of the church. Having proceeded on a libel given in against him by Robert Pont, and Adam Johnston, the presbytery found the bishop guilty of falsehood and double-dealing, erroneous doctrine, opposition to the discipline of the church, and contempt of the late public

and his remaining days were embittered by every species of annoyance and importunity. He had become wholly defenceless. The Act of Annexation had stripped him pretty completely of his pecuniary resources; a mortal disease confined him to his bed, and James, with that selfish levity, which never left him even in riper age, was deaf to his appeals. In the last stage of his miseries, when he could no longer hold a pen, some presbyterian zealots, who besieged his bed, wrung from him an admission that prelacy has no scriptural warrant, but is a mere invention of man, serving for a foundation to the primacy of the pope, or anti-christ. Substantially worthless as was a concession of this kind, it was received by the general assembly, immediately circulated, and eventually printed, under the title of *Mr. Patrick Adamson's Recantation*. The advantage thus instantly taken of his necessities and weakness was greatly to the dying prelate's disquietude.¹ As he was, however, not only at the head of his order, but also, probably, its ablest member, and long its unfailing supporter, this miserable exhibition of him was of some use to the presbyterian party.² The progress of that party was, however, chiefly aided by the want of an efficient control over a lawless community. The unwonted calm that prevailed while James was in Denmark, had wholly ceased under his incompetent and uncertain administration. Scotland had rarely been in a state of greater anarchy, and by consequence, the government was daily falling in popular estimation.³ The presbyterian party judiciously took advan-

thanksgiving; and therefore deposed him from all function in the ministry, and debarred him from the privileges in the church, until he should give satisfaction for his offensive conduct.' M'Crie's *Melville*, i. 314.

¹ Russell, ii. 30. 'The circumstances in which the archbishop subscribed his recantation necessarily throw a degree of suspicion over the sincerity with which it was made, and detract from its value as a testimony in favour of presbytery. But there is not the least reason to doubt the genuineness of the document itself.'—'Spotswood allows that he subscribed the articles which were afterwards imprinted under the name of *Mr. Patrick Adamson's Recantation*; but he alleges, that when it was told him that such a recantation was published in his name, he complained heavily of the wrong that was done him, and committing his cause to God, ended his days in the end of this year. The recantation was subscribed April 18, 1591.—Adamson survived this ten months.—By its being published, Spotswood must mean its being made publicly known: and surely Adamson knew, when he subscribed the paper, that this was the use to be made of it. It does not appear to have been printed until the year 1598.' (M'Crie's *Melville*, i. 317.) So shameful was the destination to which iniquitous laws had

reduced the archbishop, and in which the unfeeling young man upon the throne suffered him to remain, that he was driven to the galling necessity of applying for assistance to his old enemy, Melville. He 'immediately visited him, supported his family out of his own purse for some months, and afterwards procured a contribution for him from his friends in St. Andrew's.' (*Ibid.* 316.) Thus, in fact, an aged man, overwhelmed by bodily disease and grinding poverty, subscribed, perhaps he hardly knew what, at the pressing instances of the only persons whom he could arouse to the least appearance of feeling.

² 'Such a confession from the most learned person of the episcopal order, was considered as a testimony which the force of truth had extorted from an adversary.' Robertson, iii. 95.

³ 'The king's excessive clemency towards offenders multiplied crimes of all kinds, and encouraged such acts of violence as brought his government under contempt, and proved fatal to many of his subjects. The history of several years, about this time, is filled with accounts of the deadly quarrels between the great families, and of murders and assassinations perpetrated in the most audacious manner, and with circumstances of the utmost barbarity. All the defects in the feudal aristocracy were now felt more sen-

tage of its despised and helpless condition.¹ When Parliament met at Edinburgh, in June, 1592, it was called upon by the assembly to abrogate the acts of 1584, to sanction the provisions of the *Second Book of Discipline*, to repeal the *Act of Annexation*, and to prevent holders of ecclesiastical baronies uncommissioned by the presbyterian church, from sitting any longer in the legislature. The first of these requests was granted so far as to render the act of 1584 inoperative against 'the privilege that God has given to spiritual office-bearers in the kirk.' The provisions of the *Second Book of Discipline* were, to a very great extent, made law, and thus presbyterianism was formally established. The *Act of Annexation*, however, was not repealed, nor were the prelates deprived of their seats in Parliament.² It is plain that James was anxious to concede nothing which he felt himself able to withhold; and having so far succeeded as to obtain the legal establishment of their own system, the presbyterians were glad enough to forego the immediate prospect of ulterior advantages. They were, in fact, long under apprehension of a total failure. Many of the nobility were utterly averse from their demands, and only agreed to them, at last, under an expectation of their rejection by the crown. Nor would they, probably, have received the royal assent had not James, at that time, been galled and embarrassed by extreme unpopularity, arising from the inefficiency of his government. Under this pressure, he was persuaded by the chancellor to concede the presbyterian question as an act likely, above all others, to recover him in the estimation of his people. He did not, however, give way until Parliament was upon the very eve of dissolution; so that the commissioners of the general assembly could hardly believe their delighted ears when the act, establishing presbytery, was proclaimed, among others, at the market-cross of Edinburgh.³

§ 27. By this concession to the most intolerant of their enemies, the Romanists, who were still numerous and powerful in the north, were naturally much disgusted and disquieted. As usual with British members of their communion, at that time, they thought of aid from

silly, perhaps, than at any other period in the history of Scotland, and universal licence and anarchy prevailed to a degree scarce consistent with the preservation of society: while the king, too gentle to punish, or too feeble to act with vigour, suffered all these enormities to pass with impunity.' Robertson, iii. 95.

¹ 'The juncture for pushing this measure was well chosen.' *Ibid.* 98.

² 'It is worthy of notice too, that although the Discipline was ratified, as having, in fact, been for some time introduced and made the rule by which ecclesiastical proceedings were conducted in several parts of the kingdom, there still was a spiritual estate, representing the clergy in parliament, and possessing a share of the power, rank, and patrimony which belonged to the established church. James would

not consent to the petition of the ministers, when they solicited that the different orders of prelates might be deprived of their seats and votes in the legislature. Nor could he be prevailed upon to annul the statute of annexation, by which so large a portion of the sacred property had been vested in the crown, and from whence the wants of the preachers might have been amply supplied. In short, the king limited his concessions to the very narrowest bounds; and while he conferred rather an ungracious assent in favour of the presbyterian form, he seems to have reserved in his hands the means of bestowing income and honour upon a more acceptable polity. Spotswood remarks that the act passed, but in the most wary terms that could be devised.' Russell, ii. 36.

³ M'Crie's *Melville*, i. 324.

Spain, and entered into a treasonable communication with Philip. More or less of their movements having quickly transpired, the presbyterian party became violently excited. Nor were plots and negotiations alone the fruits of this connexion between Scottish and continental Romanism. Philip transmitted a sum of money to the popish lords, and thus enabled them to take the field. James being quite unprepared to face them there, gave a commission for this purpose to other clans at feud with them. The latter were, however, defeated in October, 1595, at Glenlivet, and the king was obliged to pawn his jewels, and make otherwise such exertions to stay the progress of rebellion, as the insurgent peers had no means of resisting, and they obtained the royal permission to retire abroad.¹ But notwithstanding the vigour which James displayed upon this occasion, he showed both before and afterwards anything rather than dislike of the Romish faction. In principle, he was, indeed, a staunch protestant, and he prided himself on his knowledge of reformed polemics. He was, however, partial to many of his own nobility who adhered to the religious creed of their fathers, while, probably, he entertained a dislike for all the leaders of the presbyterian party. He was besides, constantly building upon the English succession, and being fully aware of the difficulties in his way, he would gladly have conciliated those numerous and wealthy families in the southern kingdom, which repudiated the reformation. From these various causes, his administration was distinguished by a leniency towards Romanists, that gave great offence to the presbyterian party. Its preachers, in return, took such liberties with public affairs generally, and with himself in particular, as he bore with great impatience. Instances of this licence occasionally made more noise than usual, and must have offended many serious minds, little regardful of party strife, but anxious for the public tranquillity, and for confining the pulpit to its proper functions.² Advantage of such feelings could not fail of being taken by enemies to presbyterianism. The Romanist would contrast recent licentiousness with exaggerated pictures of former tranquillity. The episcopalian protestant would consider a fair trial of his own favourite polity likely to have averted existing causes of uneasiness and offence. The latter view was, probably, taken by the court, which seems to have been ever upon the watch to circumscribe the pretensions of general assemblies, restrain the licence of preachers, and provide some effective control over the church by the restoration of bishops. Occasion was taken for accomplishing this last object from a tumult at Edinburgh, on the 17th of December, 1596, in which James was much alarmed by presbyterian violence, and, as episcopalian writers represent, was really in considerable danger.³ The other side will not allow that anything occurred beyond a vexatious

¹ Robertson, iii. 113.

² 'However powerful the motives might be which influenced the clergy, or however laudable the end they had in view, they conducted their measures with no address,

and even with little prudence.' *Ibid.* 120.

³ 'On no occasion was the life of James exposed to greater jeopardy.' Russell, ii. 62.

and embarrassing uproar, of no real importance whatsoever.¹ Be this as it may, the court clearly saw an opening for fastening new discredit upon presbytery, and representing a return to something like the old ecclesiastical system, as the most feasible means for bridling an unruly pulpit, and thereby restoring public tranquillity. The king, accordingly, lost no time in quitting Edinburgh, and immediately after his departure, all official persons were commanded to wait upon him at Linlithgow, and all who were not ordinarily resident in the capital, were ordered to leave it instantly. The tumult was declared to be ‘a cruel and barbarous attempt against his majesty’s royal person, his nobility, and council, at the instigation of certain seditious ministers and barons.’ The courts of justice were ordered to remove to Perth, and neither general assemblies, provincial synods, nor presbyteries, were henceforth to sit in Edinburgh. Considerable severities against individuals followed, and then appeared a series of fifty-five questions, sanctioned by the king, displaying anew the prominent objections to presbyterianism. These were to be considered in a general assembly and meeting of estates to be holden at Perth, in the end of February.² The southern presbyteries began at once upon a resolute resistance: the northern, as usual, stood aloof. Few of their members had ever been seen in the general assemblies. They were too remote and poor: too little also under the influence of motives that swayed their brethren who moved in more stirring scenes. The court now sent a dexterous agent among them, who descanted upon the folly and mischief of suffering a knot of busy men, in and near the capital, to manage all the ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland, according to their own factious humour, and offered pecuniary assistance to such members as could not otherwise attend the assembly, whenever it should meet at an inconvenient distance from their homes.³ This, however, it became the practice to avoid as much

¹ ‘Had it not been laid hold of by designing politicians for accomplishing their measures, it would not now have been known that such an event had even occurred; and were it not that it has been so much misrepresented to the disparagement of the ministers and ecclesiastical polity of Scotland, it would be a waste of time and labour to institute an inquiry into the real state of the facts.’ *McCrie’s Melville*, i. 411.

² ‘This measure had been previously resolved upon, and the questions were prepared before the 17th of December, although the publication of them was deferred to this time.’ (*Ibid.* ii. 9.) If this be true, and the Calderwood MS. makes it seem so, the Edinburgh tumult must have been a sort of prize to the government, enabling it to make out a much stronger case, than was producible only from the late pulpit broils. Probably, James and his advisers thought themselves quite as much justified in making the most of an unexpected opportunity for discrediting the presbyterians, as these latter

were in using the royal unpopularity to extort the concessions of 1592.

³ ‘The ministers in the neighbourhood of Edinburgh, notwithstanding the parity established by the presbyterian government, had assumed a leading in the church which filled their brethren with envy.’ (Robertson, iii. 131.) ‘The ministers in the northern parts of the kingdom had rarely attended the general assembly, owing to their distance from the place of its meeting, and the deficiency of their incomes. They were comparatively unacquainted with its modes of procedure, and strangers to the designs of the court, not to mention their general inferiority in point of gifts to their brethren of the south.’ (*McCrie’s Melville*, ii. 13.) Thus it is confessed by the presbyterian writers that the church had been revolutionised by a small compact body of agitators in and near the capital. As to their superiority to the great mass of their brethren, it is little else than gratuitous assumption. Dr. Russell is equally justified in adopting

as possible; James finding it an easier, as well as a more reputable, and less onerous course, to neutralise the fiery polemics of Edinburgh and its vicinity, by finding them a vent in places where a sufficiency of tamer spirits was at hand.¹ Having pretty well secured a majority of the assembly, and gained by persuasion, or less honourable means, a few of the members who had formerly been conspicuous on the popular side, the court was enabled to carry its leading objects at Perth, and Dundee, in the early part of 1597. The clerical body in these places imposed restrictions upon the introduction of political topics and personal aspersions into sermons, pronounced summary excommunications unlawful, agreed to the prohibition by statute of meetings of the general assembly without royal authority, and consented to the nomination of incumbents in large towns by the crown, with consent of the several congregations. Besides gaining these points, which gave facilities, hitherto sternly refused, for dealing with party-politics in the pulpit, and admitted the superiority of law over clerical assemblies, the court skilfully availed itself of an existing arrangement to prosecute its ulterior views. The general assembly had usually, before separation, nominated a committee of its members to execute particular measures, or merely watch over the interests of religion, until the next meeting. James now proposed that such a committee should be nominated as a sort of ecclesiastical council to himself, which might guide him in preparing measures for a future occasion. In this too he was gratified.²

§ 28. By the commissioners of the general assembly, now brought into close connexion with the crown, an important application was made to parliament, in December, 1597. No clergyman can shut his eyes to the evil of having his order either imperfectly represented, or altogether unrepresented in the national legislature. From such disadvantages flow disregard of clerical interests, and misapprehension of ecclesiastical questions, upon many occasions, which require the one to be respected, and the other to be understood. It was impossible to prevent the Scottish clergy from seeing the unfairness of their position as an unrepresented body in parliament, notwithstanding the assumptions which the general assemblies had hitherto been able to sustain. But the war that they had waged with the institutions of their country had been supported by fostering democratic tendencies in the laity, and it is a besetting evil of such tendencies to keep all persons down who can be fenced off by any obvious line of demarcation. The clerical body presents this facility, and hence democracy has usually marked it out for poverty and insignificance. The Scottish

a counter assumption. 'As might have been presumed, the wiser and more moderate among the ministers, who lived at a distance from the capital, did not approve the conduct which had just been described' (the Edinburgh tumult). M'Crie's *Melville*, ii. 66.

¹ *Ibid.* 18.

² 'As, with the exception of an individual or two named to save appearances,

they were devoted to the court, he was enabled by their means to exercise as much power in the church as he did by his privy council in the state. *A wedge taken out of the church to rend her with her own forces!* says Calderwood; the very needle, says James Melville, *which drew in the episcopal thread.*' *Ibid.* 24.

ministers, being indebted for their provision, such as it was, and for their hopes of a better, to lay selfishness, were contented to meet observations upon the palpable want of clerical influence in parliament, by talking of ruling elders, or some such persons, to represent the church there.¹ But, independently of his monarchical partialities for established institutions, James had no desire for an infusion of spirit into the habitually passive character of a Scottish parliament, from that very class which pulpit eloquence had long been able to array in unmanageable defiance of his authority. He rather thought, as it was natural that he should think, of the old ecclesiastical estate. In turning his attention to this, he might really be little or nothing more solicitous of securing a fair position for his clerical subjects, than were the presbyterians. But he felt severely the want of some parliamentary counterpoise to the power of his nobility, and he could not overlook the advantage of his ancestors, who found one in an opulent and extensive prelacy. Upon such an obvious truth, it is easy to build superficial and uncharitable charges of episcopal subserviency. Reasons, at least, equally plausible, for court partiality to prelacy, may be found in the high character, information, and intelligence, required of all distinguished churchmen, and consequently possessed by most of them; in their origin from every rank, though all actually moving near, or even in the highest; in their possession of a property, which they did not inherit, and cannot transmit, and which came to them unfettered by family ties of clan or party; and in the sense of obligation to a benefactor, which would lead them to support the crown, even if its security were not identified with their own. Now this order, in spite of the varied and persevering assaults on it, during so many recent years, had never become extinct, in the Scottish parliament-house. There was a miserable sprinkling of despised and impoverished prelates, whose legislative rights were still recognised. There was a far larger and more important body of laymen, who strangely came to parliament, as abbots and priors; their qualifications having been the endowments of religious houses. From neither branch of this extraordinary prelacy could the crown reckon upon any efficient support. The surviving bishops, reeling under indigence and popular obloquy, were not only altogether without weight, but also they had no spirit for prominence of any kind, and were only anxious to drain the remains of life in unmolested privacy. The pretended abbots and priors differed merely in name from the lay aristocracy, of which they were generally members, in fact, by

¹ 'It is true that the general assembly had often complained that persons who had no authority or commission from the church, took it upon them to sit and vote in parliament in her name: and in some instances a wish had been expressed, that individuals appointed by the church should be admitted to a voice in such parliamentary causes as involved her interest. But this was not her deliberate and unanimous opinion, at least,

it had not been so for a considerable time back; and far less had she agreed that these voters should be ministers of the Gospel. On the contrary, it was the decided opinion of the principal ministers, that if the church should send representatives to parliament, they ought to be ruling elders, or such laymen as she should think proper to choose.' *M'Crie's Melville*, ii. 39.

birth. To propose, however, at once, the restoration of prelacy, after all the pains that had long been successfully taken to render it odious, would have been highly indiscreet.¹ It was, therefore, thought advisable to keep up a sufficient number of clerical members in parliament, according to immemorial usage, who should be chosen out of the body of ministers, and receive from the crown the titles and benefices of the ancient parliamentary prelates. This proposition proved agreeable to those commissioners of the general assembly, who had been named as ecclesiastical advisers to the sovereign, and they petitioned parliament accordingly. Their petition was readily granted, and thus, to the great indignation and alarm of the more discerning and zealous presbyterians, the year 1597 closed with no obscure indications of a return to the old prelatical institutions of the country.²

§ 29. The legislature having committed itself to this important measure, its further progress required the general assembly. That body met at Dundee, in March, 1598. James introduced its main subject of deliberation in a speech from the throne. This disclaimed any intention of introducing either papal or Anglican prelacy, and merely expressed a wish that certain of the more prudent clergy should be chosen by the general assembly to transact personally church-business in parliament, instead of standing at the doors with humble applications that some layman must carry through the house.³ Notwithstanding the speciousness of this language, and the care previously taken to secure a majority on the royal side, violent objections were raised among the more unbending presbyterians. Even when the court gained its ends by ten voices,⁴ one of the dissentients loudly protested, insisting upon the nullity of the decisions in this, and two preceding assemblies, as being fettered in their deliberations by his majesty's interference.⁵ The motions carried were three, namely, that ministers might lawfully vote in parliament and other meetings of the estates, and that some of them to represent the church were needed in all such assemblies; that their number ought to equal that of the bishops, abbots, and priors, anciently summoned, being fifty-one individuals; and that the choice of these representatives should

¹ 'The prejudices which the nation had conceived against the name and character of bishops were so violent, that James was obliged, with the utmost care, to avoid the appearance of a design to revive that order.' Robertson, iii. 133.

² 'The royal influence was exerted in overcoming any objections which were entertained against this measure on the part of the nobility, who humoured his majesty by granting more than was asked by the petitioners. It was declared that the prelacy was the third estate of the kingdom; that such ministers as his majesty should please to raise to the dignity of bishop, abbot, or other prelate, should have as complete a right to sit and vote in parliament as those of the ecclesiastical estate had enjoyed at any former period; and that

bishoprics, as they became vacant, should be conferred on none but such as were qualified and disposed to act as ministers or preachers. The spiritual power to be exercised by bishops in the government of the church, was left by the parliament to be settled between his majesty and the general assembly, without prejudice in the meantime, to the authority possessed by the several ecclesiastical judicatories.' M'Crie's *Melville*, ii. 37.

³ Calderwood, *Epist. Philad. Vind. Altare Damascenum*, 761.

⁴ 'The measure was carried chiefly by the votes of the elders, and it was urged by the minority that a number of them had no commission; but the demand of a scrutiny was resisted.' M'Crie's *Melville*, ii. 46.

⁵ Calderwood: *ut supra*.

be vested in the crown and church conjointly. The administration was prepared with further proposals as to the manner of electing the intended representatives, their name, revenues, and the restrictions necessary to prevent them from abusing their powers; but appearances of a favourable reception soon grew so unpromising, that it was thought better to rest satisfied, for the present, with advantages already gained. A new commission was therefore to be nominated by the several provincial synods, which, in concert with the divinity professors in the universities, might attend his majesty, and consult upon ulterior arrangements. The provincial synods which were to supply the required commissioners, were themselves to be instructed by the presbyteries within their several districts, and such was the antipathy to prelacy engendered in the principal seats of agitation, that the southern presbyteries gave the narrowest instructions that could be devised. When, however, the commissioners nominated, met at Falkland, in July, 1598, although less pliable than the crown desired, they proved far more so than some of the parties whom they represented could easily endure. This has been considered as the fruit of court contrivance.¹ But really no underhand management was required. Lay members of a presbytery would naturally be far better pleased with power over their ministers, than these latter would be with its exercise, however they might, upon occasions, dilate upon the advantages of lying under such a lash. Hence, when they were protected from the interference and observation which generally pressed upon them, they could not fail of using any allowable means that came in their way, to gain a more independent position. By means of this commission, it was determined, that six ministers should be nominated for every vacant prelacy, from whom the king should choose one as the parliamentary representative: this individual, however, was to propose nothing, in his legislative capacity, unwarranted by his brethren; he was to account for his proceedings to the general assembly, to continue all the duties of an ordinary pastor, to remain in his former subjection to his proper presbytery, and to be called *a commissioner of such a place*, or *precinct*, provided that title were approved by the king and legislature; otherwise, some other title was to be found by the general assembly.²

§ 30. James appears to have been impeded in the execution of his designs by the vanity of authorship.³ In 1598 he published his *True Law of Free Monarchies*, meaning, by the last two words, those monarchies in which the sovereign is free from extraneous control.⁴ This work proved highly offensive to the democratic spirits which he was born to the hopeless task of attempting to restrain; and as their

¹ 'Matters were so craftily conducted by the agents of the court, that the delegates chosen for the conference were, in several instances, of opposite views to those of their constituents.' M'Crie's *Melville*, ii. 49.

² Collier, ii. 662. Spotswood, 453.

³ 'The literary works which James produced at this time, contributed to streng-

then the opposition to his administration.' M'Crie's *Melville*, ii. 72.

⁴ 'The treatise is, in fact, an unvarnished vindication of arbitrary power in the prince, and of passive obedience and non-resistance on the part of the people, without any exception or reservation whatever.' *Ibid.*

disapprobation was not unknown to the royal author, it is placed among the causes which made him so injudiciously severe upon presbyterianism, in his *Basilicon Doron*, which he printed in 1599.¹ Conscious of his imprudence in making thus free with a large proportion of the Scottish nation, including all its more fiery elements, James did not meditate immediate publication. His impatience, however, to see a work in print, which even eminent presbyterians treat as above mediocrity,² urged him upon the perilous gratification of having seven copies stricken off. One of these was shown by a courtier, whom the king thought incapable of betraying him, to Andrew Melville. Nothing could come half so seasonably to the patriarch of Scottish presbyterianism, who was naturally very much displeased by the prospect of a national return to episcopacy. He instantly extracted such passages as were most offensive to the presbyterian party, and sent them to his nephew, whose colleague laid them before the provincial synod of Fife.³ That body treated them as highly repreh-

¹ 'The presbyterians of Scotland could not conceal their disapprobation of the political principles of *The Law of Free Monarchies*. This was one reason of their being treated with such severity in the celebrated *Basilicon Doron*, or *Instructions of the King to his Son, Prince Henry*, which came to light in the course of the following year.' M'Crie's *Melville*, ii. 74.

² 'Notwithstanding the great alterations and refinements in national taste since that time, we must allow this to be no contemptible performance, and not to be inferior to the works of most contemporary writers, either in purity of style or justness of composition.' (Robertson, iii. 137.) 'Though an impartial examination of its contents will not justify the high encomiums passed upon it, yet its literary merits are not contemptible. It is more free from childish and disgusting pedantry, and contains many good advices, mingled, however, with not a few silly prejudices.' (M'Crie's *Melville*, ii. 79.) The episcopal party went, of course, a good deal further. 'The tract is written with a compass of thought and learning, and everywhere distinguished with a predominancy of honesty and conscience. The royal author received the justice of being admired for his virtue and capacity; particularly this book recommended his majesty strongly to the esteem of the English; insomuch that all the discourses then published for maintaining his right to succeed queen Elizabeth, did not do him so much service as this product of his own pen.' (Collier, ii. 663.) This last assertion is taken from Spotswood, but Dr. M'Crie has thus weakened its claims for anything beyond a very qualified admission of it, at best. 'I have seen no reason to think that it was reprinted until 1603, in the course of which year it went through

three editions; all of them, probably, published after the death of Elizabeth. If this was the fact, the wonderful influence which Spotswood says it had in promoting James's accession must have been *ex post facto*. I have not seen it mentioned between 1599 and 1603. One of the seven copies might be conveyed to some of the courtiers of Elizabeth in the secret correspondence which James carried on with them during that interval; but they had other reasons than his merits as an author for favouring his title.' (*Melville*, ii. 454.) That one of the seven copies really was transmitted to some Englishman in correspondence with James is highly probable, and for the purpose of enabling that individual to mention in private, but influential circles, the Scottish monarch's anti-puritanical principles. Such information would be certain to make its way, and could not fail of lessening the objections which many Englishmen felt to James on account of his low-church education. Thus the *Basilicon Doron*, though not published, but only privately circulated, might, notwithstanding, have had some weight in securing an easy recognition of the Scottish title.

³ 'The propositions laid before the synod were the following: That the office of a king is of mixed kind, partly civil and partly ecclesiastical: That a principal part of his function consists in ruling the church: That it belongs to him to judge when preachers wander from their text, and that such as refuse to submit to his judgment in such cases ought to be capitally punished: That no ecclesiastical assemblies ought to be held without his consent: That no man is more to be hated of a king than a proud puritan: That parity among ministers is irreconcilable with monarchy, inimical to order, and

sible, and, pretending to believe it impossible that James could have written any such matter, transmitted them to him as libellous attempts to lower his character. Finding himself to have committed no small indiscretion in thus needlessly running into unpopularity, the king afterwards published his work with some qualifications, and an apologetical preface.¹ But it had already done its work, by raising up new opposition to his plans as the treacherous devices of a prince, arbitrary in principle, and insincere in dealing, who was bent upon beating down all opposition to his own will, and pretended a regard for an ecclesiastical

the mother of confusion. That puritans had been a pest to the commonwealth and church of Scotland, wished to engross the civil government as tribunes of the people, sought the introduction of democracy into the state, and quarrelled with the king because he was a king: That the chief persons among them should not be allowed to remain in the land: in fine, That parity in the church should be banished, episcopacy set up, and all who preached against bishops rigorously punished. Such were the sentiments which James entertained, and which he had printed, at the very time that he was giving out that he had no intention of altering the government of the church, or of introducing episcopacy.' (M'Crie's *Melville*, ii. 76.) The king's printing and speaking certainly form a sufficiently disreputable contrast. But he, probably, thought his difficulties a full excuse for double-dealing. Many other selfish men, especially in that age, would have thought so too. His ends were, to disarm presbyterianism in Scotland, if not eventually to supersede it by episcopacy, and to conciliate the episcopal party in England. But however any man may delude himself into a notion that dissimulation is allowable under his peculiar circumstances, no one can help smarting severely if it should be exposed. A vindictive feeling from having so smarted, when Melville so eagerly laid hold of the *Basilicon Doron*, joined to the rankling recollection of many former liberties, probably led James into the ungenerous treatment of his old adversary, when an English throne gave him the power for which he had so long sighed. In 1606, he called Melville with six others of the leading presbyterians to London, together with the two Scottish archbishops, and three of the bishops, for the purpose of conferring upon the best mode of settling the ecclesiastical disputes in their native country. Melville conducted himself before James's court with a degree of spirit, which occasionally degenerated into violence and ill-manners. Among his weaknesses was a habit of indulging in the composition of satirical Latin epigrams. Being taken to the chapel royal, his puritanical antipathies were violently excited by the sight of the

altar-table adorned with two closed books, two empty chalices, and two candlesticks with unlighted candles. On returning to his lodgings, he thus gave vent to his contemptuous indignation:—

*Cur stant clausi Anglis libri duo regia in ara,
Lumina cæca duo, pollubra sicca duo?
Num sensum cultumque Dei tenet Anglia
clausum,*

*Lumine cæca suo, sorde sepulta sua?
Romano an ritu dum regalem instruit aram,
Purpuream pingit religiosa lupam?*

A copy of this foolish pasquinade was officiously taken to the king, by some person who had surreptitiously made one without the aged epigrammatist's knowledge or consent. James professed himself highly incensed. He probably found rise to his vindictive remembrance, an epigram that Melville had made, several years before, on seeing him dancing about the room, as was not unnatural at his then time of life, while in deep mourning for his unhappy mother, who had recently been beheaded. The verses, which were quite as ill-timed as the young king's levity, were these. They allude to Mary's reported levity on Darnley's murder:—

*Quid sibi vult tantus lugubri sub veste ca-
chinnus?*

Scilicet hic matrem deflet, ut illa patrem.
When, however, his chapel was attacked, instead of the exuberance of his youthful spirits, James had the power of taking ample vengeance upon the man whose prurient wit had repeatedly galled him, and who had crossed his policy, and addressed him in the freest language, through life. Melville was now committed for *scandalum magnatum*, and after some confinement in private houses, he was sent to the tower, where he remained four years. At the expiration of this imprisonment, he was allowed to go to the continent, and he died divinity professor at Sedan, in 1622, at the age of seventy-seven. His long importance in the Scottish presbyterian struggle, and the personal dislike which his numerous liberties could not fail of engendering in James, will account for the severity with which he was eventually treated. Nothing that he did can excuse it.

¹ M'Crie's *Melville*, ii. 76, 454.

polity which he really abhorred, and meant to suppress upon the first opportunity.

§ 31. Difficulties, at length, were sufficiently overcome to render it likely that the Falkland arrangements would be ratified by the general assembly. That body was, accordingly, convened at Montrose, as a place convenient for attendance from the north, on the 28th of March, 1600. To the importance of its proceedings all Scotland was thoroughly alive; and, in spite of royal influence, the rigid presbyterians took their seats under sanguine expectations of a victory.¹ They did, indeed, make a strenuous resistance, and so far succeeded as to impose upon the future clerical members of parliament two restrictions which did not come recommended from Falkland. By one of these, the legislative delegate was disqualified from sitting in the general assembly unless under an especial authority from his own presbytery; by the other, canvassing for the parliamentary trust was to render a man incapable of it.² Upon other questions, the Melville party was defeated; and thus a step towards the restoration of episcopacy was not only gained by the court, but also accepted by the church. This defeat acted as a sedative upon some of the more violent spirits, and Scotland remained more tranquil, during several succeeding years, than it had been for a considerable time before.³ Hence there is great excuse for the endeavours eventually made to restore a regular episcopacy. To say nothing of mere partiality for that form of religious polity, or of an opinion in its favour founded upon ecclesiastical history, the crown might reasonably consider it better calculated than presbytery for securing an orderly community. It was impossible, besides, to overlook the violent party-struggles by which the ancient ecclesiastical system was overthrown, and the recency of presbyterian triumphs must have made opponents regard them as nothing more than temporary advantages which the course of events might any day annul. In 1600, and for several years afterwards, the episcopalian party could not attribute any character of permanence to a great constitutional innovation, which received legislative sanction, and that under peculiar circumstances, so lately as 1592. Nor could it be forgotten, that the innovation, after all, had not the character of completeness, and consequently, the aspect of finality. An anomalous kind of prelacy survived the shock, and must have been meant by the party overpowered to serve as a foundation for reconstructing the old edifice upon an improved principle, whenever present heats and prejudices should have sufficiently died away. That such intentions eventually miscarried, an episcopalian will naturally regret, and he may do so the more reasonably, because a difference of polity weakens the resistance of British protestantism to the common Romish enemy. In most respects, however, the churches of north and south Britain have long stood in amicable

¹ M'Crie's *Melville*, ii. 58.

² Collier, ii. 663.

³ 'The decisive measures now adopted by

the church were rewarded by the continuance of tranquillity during several years.'

Russell, ii. 72.

relation to each other. Holding the same rule of faith, and party-contests about episcopacy having long sunk into mere history, there are no longer any violent antipathies on either side. The Englishman does full justice to the scriptural principles, and valuable ministrations of the northern clergy; and the Scot, in a southern home, is very commonly a conformist to the religion of his adopted country. Nor are families by any means rare, in which some members belong to one church, and some to the other, without any abatement of mutual good-will. The two religious communities are, indeed, so much identified in interest, as well as in doctrine, that no judicious member of either has any disposition to magnify their differences with each other. Rather, are both venerated as labouring for a common object of the greatest importance, by all who feel the value of sound religion, and know the impossibility of spreading it over a whole nation without endowments tolerably commensurate with the country.

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.*

§ 1. State of Ireland from Henry II. to the Reformation — § 2. Henry VIII. — § 3. Edward VI. — § 4. Mary — § 5. First religious movements under Elizabeth — § 6. The Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity — § 7. Immediate consequences of these acts — § 8. Rebellion of John O'Neil — § 9. Uneasiness of Munster — § 10. Foreign interference in Irish affairs — § 11. Stukeley — § 12. Papal invasion — § 13. Rebellion of Desmond — § 14. Rebellion of Hugh O'Neil — § 15. Foundation of Trinity college, Dublin — § 16. Ussher's acceptance of the Jesuit's challenge.

§ 1. THE acquisition of a superiority over Ireland by Henry II. was greatly aided, at the very least, by a desire of the national hierarchy to attain that independent and prosperous condition, which was then common to all clerical communities closely connected with Rome.¹ Hitherto the native chieftains had exercised a power over the church which ordinarily kept its ministers poor and subservient.² It was,

* By Mr. Soames.

¹ 'They' (the bishops) 'had now, though at the high price of the independence of their country, purchased no inconsiderable emoluments for themselves. Their demesnes, which were ample, but hitherto exposed to the ravages of an unscrupulous laity, had at length found a protector: the claim of tithes, which for some time they had been endeavouring to maintain by spiritual censures, and the *dogma* of divine right was henceforth to be enforced by the

secular arm.' Dr. Phelan's *History of the Policy of the Church of Rome in Ireland*, Lond. 1827, p. 9.

² 'Under the ancient system, an Irish prince was as absolute master of the priesthood of his sept, as of any other class among his followers. But a new order of things was introduced by Henry II., and thenceforward kept regular pace with the advance of British and papal power. All the privileges of the English church, and all those vexatious pretensions which had

probably, with a view of counteracting this unfriendly influence, that Malachy O'Morgair, who resigned the see of Armagh for that of Down, in 1137, undertook a journey to Rome. He received a cordial welcome from the pope, and was gladly appointed legate for Ireland.¹ In this capacity he was enabled, on his return home, to prepare the country for a regular papal agent, or apostolic legate, John Paparo, cardinal priest, who arrived in 1152, with four palls, the first seen in Ireland, for the four archbishops of Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam: an insidious compliment, serving here, as elsewhere, for the first point of a wedge to undermine the nation's ecclesiastical independence. Without more substantial appliances, however, palls and all other such artifices were likely to leave the church of Ireland very much in its old condition under the native chieftains. The hierarchy, accordingly, gladly made terms with the English in 1171, and henceforth its power went regularly forward, in spite of the native opposition which often impeded it. The country had, obviously, no means of effectual resistance to it. The English monarchs called themselves no more than *lords of Ireland*, and their position in that country seems to have been ordinarily considered inferior to the royal: in fact, subordinate to the papacy.² Actual authority beyond a level district round the capital, comprised in the small counties of Louth, Meath, Kildare, and Dublin,³ they had scarcely any. Even of this narrow district, known as the *English Pale*, a broad exterior line formed no small portion of *debateable* land, in which English law could find but a precarious footing.⁴ Without the *Pale*, either native chieftains, or Anglo-Norman proprietors, who had degenerated from feudal nobles into mere barbaric leaders, held little less than sovereign sway within their several regions.⁵ The royal family of Plantagenet was grievously mistaken

just attained a temporary triumph in the canonisation of Thomas à Becket, were communicated to the Irish clergy, and maintained by them with more pertinacity, in proportion to the weakness of the civil power.' (Phelan, 50.) In early times, the Irish clergy took no oaths to the pope: they applied to him for no bulls, and never appealed to him. The prelates were appointed by the chieftains of the different tribes, either directly, or after an election by the priesthood. Papal legates had no jurisdiction until the twelfth century, and long could establish none afterwards, beyond the English settlements. In consequence of these variations from the ecclesiastical system generally established at an earlier period in western Europe, the Irish church is treated with great contempt by papal writers of the twelfth century. (*Ibid.* 48.)

¹ 'An office recently instituted, and previously filled by only one occupant.' Bp. Mant's *History of the Church of Ireland*. Lond. 1840, p. 5.

² 'Irishmen of long continuance have

supposed the royal estate of this land to consist in the bishop of Rome for the time being, and the lordship of the kings of England here to be but a governance under the obedience of the same; which causeth them to have more respect of due subjection unto the said bishop, than unto our sovereign lord.' Allen, master of the Rolls: *apud* Mant, 106.

³ 'A district which extended not quite thirty miles to the north and north-west of Dublin.' Phelan, 126.

⁴ 'Of the *Pale* itself an ample stripe, comprehending a third, and sometimes a half of each county, was *border land*; in which a mixed code of English, Brehon, and martial law, and of such points of honour as are recognised among freebooters, suspended for a season the final appeal to the sword.' *Ibid.* x.

⁵ 'Some of them' (the great English lords), 'as the two great branches of the De Burgo family, the Geraldines of Kerry, and the Birminghams, lords of Athenry, renounced the language, laws, and usages

in thus neglecting a possession so very valuable. Had it made use of English resources to reduce every part of Ireland under a real subjection, and either to merge the native chieftainry in a civilised peerage, or extirpate it altogether, the whole community would have gradually blended itself, as elements equally discordant did in England, into one uniform body. Unhappily, however, English enterprise could see no other field than France. A court and aristocracy, transplanted from that inviting country, were ever haunted by splendid visions of a victorious return thither; and if great exertions were to be made for any object over sea, they always took a continental aim. The Plantagenets, indeed, would have found it impossible to neglect Ireland, as they did, if the monarchies of Europe had been consolidated. But all the continental states were still so disjointed, as to render speculations on the balance of power unnecessary. Hence no English statesman thought of Ireland as an opening for foreign aggression upon his own country. Other countries, however, while gradually undergoing those political changes which eventually made them members of a great European commonwealth, were also under formation into homogeneous masses within their several communities. Ireland, from the neglect of its nominal rulers, had no such advantage. It remained a land parcelled out among a number of petty chieftains with conflicting interests, and hence continually at war. Among grounds of antipathy was difference of race. The aboriginal Irish were despised and hated by those of Anglo-Norman origin, whose ancestors were private adventurers that had conquered portions of them, but left an unsubdued majority to infuriate and baffle their posterity. The *hutrail*, at least, could be returned, and it was most heartily, drawing continually fresh exasperation from outrages perpetrated by the two parties on each other: thus when European nations generally came forward in their modern amalgamated form, Ireland retained the discordant features that had vanished from all of them but herself, long ago.¹ Her nominal

of the mother country, They had been smitten with the barbaric circumstances and unlimited sway of the native chieftains: they became chieftains themselves; assumed Irish appellations, and moulded their motley followers into the form of Irish tribes. Others, retaining the English name, and something of English manners, acquired, at a less price, nearly equal dominion. In the space of thirty years after the first descent, eight palatinates, comprehending two-thirds of the English settlements, were erected in Ireland; there was afterwards added a ninth, the county of Tipperary, the splendid domain of the earls of Ormond. *Within* these districts, the lords possessed all royal rights, created knights, and even barons, appointed their own judges, sheriffs, seneschals, and held their own courts for the determination of all causes: *without*, they exercised the de-

testable prerogative of waging civil war in all quarters of the island. Armed with these enormous powers, they proceeded to reduce or exterminate their own countrymen of the middle class who had presumed to set an example of comfort and independence. Many of these fled; their lands were seized by the lords and parcelled out among the conquered Irish, to be held on Irish tenures; many others surrendered a part of their property, in the hope of being allowed the quiet possession of the remainder; but this grace was refused, and they were gradually broken in spirit and circumstances to the villanage of the native population.' Phelan, ix.

¹ The elements of Irish society were even kept in a state of discordance by legislative interference. 'In the lieutenancy of Lionel, duke of Clarence (1367), a parliament was held at Kilkenny, which passed an act me-

executive had nothing more than military possession of a mere fraction of the country, and of her semi-barbarous chieftains, one portion abhorred the other as an intrusive alien despoiler and occupant of its own rightful inheritance.

§ 2. Upon indifference, if not hostility, to the prelacy, both portions were agreed. Hence Henry VIII. found his ecclesiastical innovations very little more embarrassed by lay opposition, than they had been in England. Yet with the hierarchy it was quite otherwise. When the royal supremacy came before the English public, nearly all non-monastic parties treated it as a claim on the crown's part so incontrovertible, that it was conceded at once. Prelates, who subsequently strove with most ingenious pertinacity to preserve every feature of the Romish religion, emulously repudiated papal claims to jurisdiction over England, as a monstrous usurpation. In Ireland a very different spirit prevailed upon the episcopal bench. George Cromer, the primate, who filled also, at one time, the high office of chancellor, took the lead in a strenuous opposition to Henry's proposed assumption of papal privileges, and his order generally showed an equal determination to maintain the existing system. Thus recognition of the king's ecclesiastical claims was not obtained from the Irish legislature until after some delay and much

morale above all others in the sad annals of Irish legislation, and very generally known as the *Statute of Kilkenny*. It was decreed by this statute, that marriage, nurture of infants, or *gossiped* with the Irish, or submission to the Irish law, should be considered and punished as high treason. Again, if any man of English race should use the Irish dress, or language, or take an Irish name, or observe any rule or custom of the Irish, he was to forfeit lands and tenements, until he had given security, in the court of chancery, that he would conform in every particular to the English manners. Further, it was made highly penal, to present a mere Irishman (that is, one who had not purchased a charter of denization, and conformed to the English usages, civil and religious,) to an ecclesiastical benefice, or receive him into a monastery, or other religious house; to entertain an Irish bard, minstrel, or storyteller, or to admit an Irish horse to graze on the pasture of an Englishman.' (Phelan, 64.) It is plain from this act that the Anglo-Irish of that day looked upon the aboriginal inhabitants of the country much as the present Anglo-Americans do upon the Indians and Negroes among themselves. But the dominant party was not in sufficient proportion to the indigenous population, and was besides too apt itself in learning the *clannish* or *selfish* habits which it found established, to accomplish the extermination of the race which it contemned and feared. Nothing, there-

fore, was done by such proceedings as the *Statute of Kilkenny*, but giving fresh intensity to the hatred of the tribes of unmixed Irish, for those which followed Anglo-Irish chieftains, and which were partly of English blood. The *nurture of infants*, and *gossiped*, mentioned in the *Statute of Kilkenny*, are names for two usages which bound the ancient Irish tribes into compact bodies. By the law of *Tannistry*, every man of noble blood was eligible as chieftain of the sept. Thus a considerable portion of the body felt a personal interest in the importance of its chief. The still larger portion, excluded by birth from all prospect of leadership, was consoled under its inferiority, and attached to the upper families, by being intrusted with the bringing-up of their children, and by having members of them to stand as sponsors, or *gossips*, when its own children were brought for baptism. Thus every Irish tribe formed an exclusive family community, in which all the members felt akin to each other by the ties, either of blood, or of religious relationship, or of nurture under common parents. This exclusive feeling was an intolerable national evil, when all the tribes were of Irish origin; but its disjunctive powers became more serious than ever, when some of the chieftains were of alien blood, and possessed a superiority which they exercised over their neighbours with all the ferocity, insolence, and rapacity of semi-barbarians.

difficulty. The act of supremacy being, however, at length passed in 1537, was followed, in 1542, by another to recognise the sovereign as *king* of Ireland, instead of *lord*, as he and his predecessors had hitherto been styled.¹ By the laity generally both acts were favourably received. Men are commonly pleased in seeing superiority, or even equality, destroyed. Hence the Irish chieftains displayed an unanimity hitherto unknown, in hailing acts that stripped a proud and envied prelacy of that firm extraneous protection which it had long commanded from the powerful see of Rome, and from its connexion with a compact body that embraced nearly the whole of Europe. Some of them, too, might have been aware of the time when sees were filled either mediately, or immediately, by the chiefs of the districts in which they were placed, and might hope for a similar check over the superior clergy once more. When Henry's ecclesiastical prerogatives, accordingly, became the law of Ireland, most of her great laymen came readily forward with formal acts of approval. They even sank the chieftain in the peer, and by accepting some of the usual titles of nobility, appeared likely to make society in their own island, within a few years, resemble that which had long been established in the majority of European countries.²

¹ Mant, 124, 165.

² 'It is not to be supposed that, as soon as the civil government had acquired competent strength, some effort would not be made to repress this extravagant ambition of the hierarchy, and provide for the sober exercise of its legitimate powers. The lay aristocracy, however little inclined to co-operate with the state or give the people a chance of liberty, were too much interested in such a measure to refuse it their active concurrence. The lords of English descent, irritated by a too successful rivalry; the Irish, still brooding over the original treachery of the church, and its many bitter consequences to themselves; and both, turbulent, eager for ascendancy, and accustomed to refer everything to the arbitration of the sword, would naturally rejoice in the downfall of this arrogant order. Accordingly, when Henry VIII. asserted his claim to the complete sovereignty of the island, all the nobles arrayed themselves on the side of the crown; they abolished the subordinate title of *lord*, the only one which the pope had permitted to be assumed, and proclaimed him king of Ireland, and supreme head of the church. This unanimity was not confined to that body of the nobility which conformed to the English customs, and which usually took a share in the administration of public affairs. Those powerful and refractory chieftains, who had hitherto maintained a dubious struggle against the utmost force of the state, came forward upon this occasion, with rival zeal for the honour of royalty, and the strongest

professions of their undivided allegiance. Desmond was the first who presented himself. On the 1st of January, 1540, he executed a written indenture, in which he *utterly denied, and promised to forsake, the usurped primacy and authority of the bishop of Rome, and engaged to resist and repress the same, and all that should by any means uphold or maintain it.* Shortly after O'Connor and O'Dunne gave similar pledges. O'Donel, in his indenture bearing date Aug. 6, 1542, declares that he *will renounce, relinquish, and to the best of his power annihilate, the usurped authority of the Roman Pontiff; that he will by no means harbour or allow in his country those who adhere to the said pontiff, but will with all diligence expel, eject, and eradicate them, and bring them into subjection to our said lord the king.* His example was followed in a week after by Mac Mahon. In the January following, O'Neil, the acknowledged leader of the northern Irish, met the king's commissioners at Maynooth, and entered into similar engagements; and in the course of that year, the same was done by O'Brien, the first chieftain of Munster, by O'More, O'Rourke, Mac Donel; and by the head of the De Burgos, who was now known by the Irish title of Mac William. The conduct of the great lords was emulously imitated by those of inferior rank. From Connaught, from Meath, from the remotest regions of the south and north, all the most turbulent heads of the Irish tribes, all those of the old English race who had adopted Irish manners, and lived for ages in rude inde-

§ 3. But besides the recognition of the royal supremacy, and the suppression of monasteries, there was little effected in Ireland, any more than in the sister-country, during Henry's reign, that indicated a decisive change in the national religion.¹ Nor were Protestant movements under Edward so early as might have been expected. At length, however, in 1551, Sir Anthony St. Leger, lord deputy, received a royal order to see the Romish ritual superseded by the new English liturgy. In consequence, an assembly of the prelacy and inferior clergy was immediately convened. It proved a stormy meeting; Dowdall, the primate, being as intractable upon the question of the liturgy, as his predecessor, Cromer, had been on that of the supremacy. This opposition, however, was not suffered to prevail, and on Easter-day, 1551, an example of using the English service was set in the cathedral of Christ church, Dublin. That archiepiscopal see had been occupied since March, 1536, by a staunch reformer, George Browne, formerly an Austin friar, who had been active in opposition to Romish prepossessions during the whole of his residence in Ireland. As a reward for his labours in behalf of Protestantism, and a check upon the practices of Dowdall, the primacy was taken away, by an English order of council, from the see of Armagh, and conferred by letters-patent upon that of Dublin.² Disgusted by this indignity, Dowdall withdrew to the

pendence, vied with each other in declarations of fidelity to the king, and executed their indentures in the amplest forms of submission.' (Phelan, 84.) 'This good humour of the aristocracy at the humiliation of a rival order, and their own brightening prospects, banished for a while those feelings and pretensions which had hitherto given most uneasiness to the government. O'Neil, whose progenitors had always affected the dignity of sovereign princes, waited on the king at Greenwich, and, after the amplest protestations of fidelity, condescended to accept the title of earl of Tyrone. O'Brien, in like manner, sank the pomp of his feudal name in the earldom of Thomond; De Burgo, whose family, for many generations, had laid aside the English manners, submitted to be known henceforth as the earl of Clanrickarde; the haughty chieftains, O'Donel and Mac Carthy, became earls respectively of Tyrconnel and Glencar; and the humility of some inferior potentates was content with the title of baron. Desmond renounced the fantastic privilege, on which his house, in imitation of the native lords and the ancient warriors of Gaul and Germany, had so long insisted, of exemption from appearance within a walled town; he promised to attend parliament, and even to pay taxes, ay, as liberally as Ormond himself; resumed his long unoccupied seat at the council-board, and assisted the lord deputy in re-

ceiving submissions. Others gave still more unequivocal proofs of loyalty. The chieftain of Tyrconnel, whose family was well known both at Rome and Paris, resisted the artifices by which Francis I. endeavoured to seduce him into a revolt; and when the son of that Fitzpatrick, whose ambassador had formerly amused the king with threats of war, was detected in some treasonable practices, he was delivered up to public justice by the hands of his own father. In fine, for the first time recorded in her annals, Ireland was now at peace under one acknowledged sovereign.' *Ibid.* 90.

¹ 'In 1538, images abused by pilgrimages and superstitions were removed; yet during the rest of the reign of king Henry, it appears that not much was accomplished, partly through the intrigues of the Roman pontiff and his adherents, and partly on account of the disturbed state of Ireland. It appears, in fact, that, notwithstanding the events which took place in 1537, the papal power continued partially to prevail in Ireland during the whole reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI.; for even so late as the year 1550, the crown occasionally admitted to the possession of their temporalities, bishops who had been provided with Irish sees at Rome.' Palmer's *Treatise on the Church of Christ*, Lond. 1842, i. 423.

² Abp. Browne 'was first taken notice of by Cromwel, lord privy seal, and by his sole means preferred to this dignity in the

Continent,¹ and being soon after stripped of his archbishopric also, Hugh Goodacre, an English divine of Protestant principles, recommended among others by Cranmer for that situation, was preferred to it. At the same time, John Bale, so famed for his zeal in the reformed cause, and for the freedom of a satirical pen in defence of it, was appointed to the see of Ossory. These promotions were an earnest of steady endeavours on the part of Edward's government, to protestantise the country. Bale immediately showed himself fully alive to the necessity of strenuous exertion, if any such object were to be realised. He was incessantly in the pulpit, haranguing against popery with all that ardent hatred of it, and all those popular powers for painting odious and ridiculous portraits, which he possessed above most men. The prebendaries of his cathedral at Kilkenny were in general offended beyond measure by his preaching, and so were many other admirers of the old system.² But in spite of their opposition, Bale's energy stood proof, as heretofore, and, had more time been allowed, a coarse fervid personal vein of eloquence such as his, might have left lasting effects upon a nation like the Irish, so strikingly fitted for enjoying it. Edward's premature death, however, soon drove him into exile, and rendered abortive all the brief efforts for protestantising Ireland, which had been recently made.

§ 4. When Mary first came to the throne, liberty was given by proclamation to attend mass, but without any threat of compulsion to those who disapproved of that service.³ The new sovereign retained, in a formal proclamation, announcing her accession, the title of *supreme head of the church*,⁴ and her first public communications with the pope did not venture to omit the title of *queen of Ireland*, which her father had assumed in contempt and defiance of those ridiculous claims to a papal superiority over the country, that Romish partisans have found so much trouble in placing upon any footing of tolerable plausibility. This assumption, however, was rendered in some degree palatable by a private letter soliciting a formal grant of the regal dignity, and, as usual, when Rome is powerless and has any interest in complaisance, Mary's Irish royalty was readily recognised at the Vatican. The pope pretended to erect

church of Ireland; upon the observation that was taken of him, when he was provincial of the Augustin order in England, advising all people to make their application only to Christ, and not to saints: whereby he was recommended to king Henry, who much favoured him.' Strype's *Cranmer*, i. 54.

¹ 'Dowdall was banished, or, as others say, voluntarily left his bishopric.' (*Ibid.*) 'I do not find that he was stripped of his bishopric, but his high stomach could not digest the affront. He went into voluntary banishment, and lived an exile for a time in foreign parts, during the remainder of the reign of king Edward VI.' (Harris *apud* Mant, 213.) This exile was at least con-

sidered an abandonment of his charge, and consequently a successor was appointed.

² Both Bale and Goodacre had been chaplains to Poynt, bishop of Winchester. Bale was a Suffolk man, and had been in a Carmelite monastery at Norwich. On Mary's accession, he had a very narrow escape with his life; Romish hostility, as might be expected, being violently excited against him. He was a married man, and spent the Marian times at Báile. Under Elizabeth, he was appointed prebendary of Canterbury, and he died in November, 1563. He probably had no desire to resume the see of Ossory.

³ Mant, 230.

⁴ Dated July 20, 1553. *Ibid.*

Ireland into a kingdom, in a secret consistory, fourteen days before the English legation was formally received.¹ The queen showed herself quite willing to earn a title to this ridiculous, degrading concession. Her proceedings in the sister-island, although marked by the feebleness of a distant authority, were sufficiently energetic on the side of popery to overthrow completely the rival system. Dowdall returned from his exile, and was reinstated, not only in the see of Armagh, but also in the primacy of all Ireland. Browne, archbishop of Dublin, was ejected from that see, by regular process, in 1554, as a married man. Four others of the prelacy met with the same fate, on the same ground.² Bale was too obnoxious to be suffered to wait for these formalities: he had fled for his life before the depriving commission sat. In a parliament assembled in June, 1556, the profession of protestantism was made penal, as it seems, for the first time; Ireland having no earlier printed statute copying those of England against Lollardy.³ It so happened, however, that the powers thus provided for a sanguinary spirit of intolerance, merely served to stain the Irish statute book. Romanism was, indeed, once more thoroughly established in Ireland, and the government decided upon following the English precedent of trampling down all opposition to it by fire and faggot. But its action upon Ireland was not quick enough to realise this intention. The lagging pace of colonial business long delayed the transmission of authority and instructions for commencing an active persecution. At length a commission for that purpose was prepared, and Dr. Cole, one of the commissioners, left London with it for Dublin. Exulting over the prospect of thus crushing Irish protestantism, he indiscreetly bragged of his charge before a woman at Chester, who was a staunch adherent of the Reformation, and had a brother in the Irish metropolis. She managed to steal the commission, and to place in its room a

¹ 'Nè l' erezione dell' Ibernia in reame si fece allora;' (May 30) 'mà erasi fatta già in un consistorio segreto a' 7 di Giugno. Ed era stato necessario che si facesse così; acciòche gli ambasciadori nel primo avvento potessero nominare come rè d' Inghilterra e d' Ibernia insieme i loro signori.' (Pallavicino, *Ist. del Conc. di Trento*, Rom. 1657, ii. 53.) 'Mary accompanied the letter presented to the pope by the ambassadors, with one in which she solicited him to confer on her the title of queen of Ireland. With this request, by a bull, transcribed by Bzovius, *ad ann.* 1555, the pope complied: the bull was dated the 7th of June, several days before the presentation of the ambassadors; and thus the difficulty, which otherwise would have arisen, was dexterously, but dishonourably eluded.' (Butler's *Hist. Mem. of the Engl. Cath.* i. 136.) The letter appears, from Pallavicino, to have been written in the joint names of Philip and Mary. Dr. Lingard makes this insulting

assumption of the pope to have originated with Pole. 'Pole had foreseen that the new title of king and queen of Ireland, assumed by Philip and Mary, in imitation of Henry and Edward, might create some difficulty, and therefore requested that Ireland might be declared a kingdom before the arrival of the ambassadors. But the death of Julius, succeeded by that of Marcellus, had prevented those pontiffs from complying with his advice; and the first act of the new pope, after his coronation, was to publish a bull, by which, at the petition of Philip and Mary, he raised the lordship of Ireland to the dignity of a kingdom.' *Hist. Engl.* vii. 186.

² Abp. Browne, together with three of the bishops deprived for matrimony, seem to have died within a short time afterwards in obscurity. Casey, of Limerick, survived the Marian times, and was restored to his see by Elizabeth. Mant, 236.

³ *Ibid.* 244.

pack of cards with the knave of clubs uppermost. Unsuspicious of his loss, the talkative messenger went on to Dublin, where he landed, October 7, 1558, and there, looking for his credentials, was confounded by finding them so ridiculously supplanted. Happily, there never were any means of replacing them in time for their employment. A new commission was, indeed, obtained, but before it could reach Dublin, queen Mary was dead.¹

§ 5. On Mary's demise,² Irish affairs felt, as usual, the distance of the impulse which was to set them in motion. Elizabeth had hardly taken her seat upon the throne, when England became impatiently apprehensive, or desirous, of religious alterations, and the queen's caution was overborne by the impetuosity of her people. Ireland appears to have been stagnant, and the remote executive was exceedingly slow in disturbing the even current which the last reign had left. The first Protestant movement made by authority appears to have been in the two cathedrals of Dublin. In the latter end of May, 1559, orders were given to paint the walls of those churches anew, expunging from them pictures, with other devices, favourable to Romanism, and placing texts of Scripture in the room which all such ornaments had occupied. It was not, however, until the end of August that any part of the public service was introduced in a living language. The Earl of Sussex, lord deputy, then took the oath of office, in Christ church, Dublin, and the Litany was sung there in English. The mass, or communion service, yet continued to be chanted and muttered in Latin: but all were aware that it must soon follow the fate of the Litany, and be made intelligible to the congregation generally, unless some popular demonstration should overawe the government into a prolongation of its present mysterious form. The lord deputy, with his council, was to attend at Christ church again on the following Sunday, and arrangements were made for a bold experiment upon the credulity of an excitable populace during the service. An image of our Saviour stood in the cathedral, with a reed in the hand, and a crown of thorns upon the head. It had been placed there by Hugh Curwen, the present archbishop, in the place of a similar figure, which his predecessor, Browne, had removed. In the earlier part of the service, no particular notice was taken of

¹ 'The sequel of the story is that, on the recalling of the lord deputy into England, queen Elizabeth discoursing with him concerning several passages in Ireland, amongst other things, he related the foregoing narrative: which so delighted the queen, that her majesty sent for the good woman, Elizabeth Edmonds, or by her husband's name, Mattershed, and gave her a pension of forty pounds a year during her life, for saving her majesty's Protestant subjects of Ireland.' Mant, 251.

² 'It is observable, that though she was a very zealous papist, yet the Irish were not quieter during her reign than they were

under her brother; but on the contrary, their antipathy against Englishmen and government induced them to be as troublesome then as at other times, and prevailed with Mr. Sullivan to give this severe character of her reign, that although the queen was zealous to propagate the catholic religion, yet her ministers did not forbear to injure and abuse the Irish. *Quæ tametsi catholicam religionem tueri et amplificare conata est, ejus tamen præfecti et conciliarii injurias Ibernis inferre non destiterunt.*' Cox's *Hibernia Anglicana*, Lond. 1689, p. 309.

it, an ordinary degree of observation discovering nothing peculiar in its appearance. At length, however, a whisper ran through the congregation: 'See how it sweats blood!' It was now found plain enough that blood was really trickling down upon the face through the crevices of the thorny crown, and as the populace gazed upon the sight, the pavement became crowded with prostrate worshippers, violently moved. The parties who had at first called attention to the portent, now supplied a solution for it. 'Our Saviour,' they said, 'could not help sweating blood on seeing heresy thus come into his own church.' Popular passion quickly took the infection, and so threatening did appearances become, that the lord deputy and his court thought it prudent to make a hasty retreat. Archbishop Curwen, however, though preferred by Mary, as likely to advance the Romish cause, had neither forgotten those early perceptions of its weakness, which originally raised him into notice, nor the policy of exposing it once more, now that its friends at court were succeeded by its enemies.¹ He therefore determined upon a merciless examination of the miracle. Desiring one of the officers of the church to mount a high form, this wonder was immediately reduced, as wonders generally may be, within very ordinary dimensions. A sponge, thoroughly soaked in blood, was dislodged from the hollow of the figure's head. A sufficient inquiry soon exposed the whole stratagem. A monk, recently attached to the cathedral, was found to have watched for an opportunity to place the sponge, and he, with three or four others, more or less in the secret, were the parties who first called attention to the trickling blood, and so ingeniously connected

¹ Hugh Curwen, whose surname is otherwise written Coren, was a native of Westmorland. He had been chaplain to Henry VIII. and preached in the conventual church at Greenwich, May 28, 1532, a sermon for the supremacy, the king being present, which moved Elstow, a friar of the house, to exclaim from the rood-loft, 'You lie:' a piece of unseasonable plain-speaking visited by imprisonment. By this, however, neither was he daunted, nor were his friends, nor was Curwen admonished by the whole transaction as to the indecency and mischief of playing the courtier in the pulpit. On the contrary, Peto, another friar of Elstow's house, preaching in the same pulpit before Henry, in the following year, 1533, made a violent attack upon his marriage with Ann Boleyn, comparing himself to Micaiah, and the king to Ahab. Curwen preached on the next Sunday, and fully paid Peto in his own coin. He was then absent at a provincial council, but Elstow was again in the rood-loft, and he immediately burst forth in a spirited rebuke of the preacher, which nothing short of the king's own interference could stop. Curwen's divinity, however, was in strict unison with that most in vogue, for he was a staunch supporter of the cor-

poral presence, and is considered to have hastened the death of Erith, by a Lent sermon, preached before Henry, containing a violent invective against the Sacramentaries, and a personal allusion to that martyr. As Strype notes him for 'complier in all reigns,' he had, of course, no difficulty in modifying his theology to suit Edward's days, nor afterwards, to meet Mary's wishes. He had been made Dean of Hereford by Henry, in 1541, and Mary found him thus benefited in 1555, when he was preferred to the archbishopric of Dublin, being, of course, thought sufficiently Romish for the queen's purposes. It is evident, however, from his conduct about our Saviour's image, in the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, that he had neither forgotten his Protestant information and discernment, nor the expediency of using them now that they were again passports to court favour. The niceness of his tact served him once more. Being weary of Ireland, where he had been lord chancellor, as well as archbishop, he obtained a translation to the see of Oxford, in 1567. In the following year he died at Swinbrook, near Burford. Mant, 237. Stow, 559, 561. Strype's *Parker*, i. 508. Le Neve, 114.

it with heavenly disapproval of a service that ordinary worshippers can understand. As the sponge was shown to the duped people who had lain awe-stricken upon the pavement, and its artful preparer was exposed to their indignant notice, some of them loudly cursed him, with such as had abetted his imposture. On the next Sunday, he and his principal confederates were placed upon a table, with hands and legs tied, and inscriptions on their breasts, in the same church;¹ and before the same distinguished assemblage that had been so abruptly broken up a week before, the archbishop preached, taking for his text, *God shall send them strong delusion, that they shall believe a lie*. A country higher in civilisation and knowledge than Ireland was then, especially with her actual advantage of an executive unfavourable to sectarian imposture, would have profited importantly by such an exposure. It occurred, however, among a people unprepared for it, and consequently certain to forget, or deny it, maintain its expediency, or explain it away, or even to believe a real miracle, so as to make its details little else than a matter of accusation to the disabusing party. England was, however, far more advanced in civilisation, and it was made effective there. It turned the scale against images in churches, which was a point then under consideration among the leading English divines. Elizabeth professed very little interest in the question either way, but her partialities were evidently on the side of images. Parker showed her a letter from the archbishop of Dublin, detailing the particulars of the late fraud in his own cathedral, and this communication, seasonably reinforcing a mass of scriptural authorities, decided the queen against church-statuary. She saw it not only liable to betray ignorant people into approaches towards idolatry, but also to furnish unprincipled impostors with facilities for deluding them.²

§ 6. In the following January, that of the year 1560, parliament followed the English precedents, in passing the acts of supremacy and uniformity. The former of these, as in the sister-country, professed to invest the crown with no new powers, but merely to revive, and render effective, those which had been habitually claimed, and occasionally exercised by it from the first.³ The act of supremacy, indeed, although often treated, for sectarian and party purposes, as an assumption that pretends to invest a lay sovereign with spiritual powers like those of the pope, is, in fact, founded upon the old statutes of *præmunire*, and the like, enacted at a time when a secession from Rome was not contemplated, and when any one would have laughed if he could have heard of a tendency in such legislation to confound kings with bishops.⁴ The act of uniformity abolished

¹ 'This punishment they suffered three Sundays; were imprisoned some time; and then banished the realm. This converted above an hundred persons present, who swore that they would never hear mass more.' Strype's *Parker*, i. 91.

² *Ibid.* 92.

³ 'And here the *Rogale* is further pressed

than in England. The determining points of faith are translated from the church upon the state: and the parliament, without the concurrence of the convocation, is made the last judge of heresy.' Collier, ii. 462.

⁴ 'The act of supremacy was really nothing more, as to its intent, than the act of *Præmunire*. The object was to restrain the

the Roman service, substituting the English for it, and rendered lay-parishioners who should not attend it, liable, as in England, to a fine of one shilling.¹ This act, however, was accompanied by a remarkable qualification, extorted by the peculiar circumstances of the country. There were parts of Ireland in which clergymen able to read English could not be found. The obvious remedy for this difficulty was an Irish translation of the liturgy; but one was not undertaken, because, according to the statute, it could not easily be printed, and if it were, few could 'read the Irish letters.'² The employment of other letters appears to have been overlooked; and in place of so simple an expedient, permission was given to read the liturgy in Latin, in cases which did not allow the use of English. Thus the Protestant church was blemished at the outset by a gross

exercise of illegal jurisdiction, and to confine within due limits the arbitrary proceedings of men, who, *under pretence of religion*, claimed a power of exclusively deciding on all matters, whether mixed or unmixed, relating to the church; men, who claimed exemptions from the law courts, pretending that they could be judged only by the pope; who frequently made the sacraments subservient to their passions, forbidding divine service, and interdicting the benefits of Christianity to all those who refused to comply with their arbitrary injunctions and decrees.' O'Conner *apud* Phelan, 104.

¹ Mant, 259.

² This strange clause has been thought, from its form, to have been no part of the bill as originally prepared, and it has been represented as 'serving to sheathe the acrimony' of popular prejudice against the Protestant liturgy, by allowing it to meet the ear in the language immemorially heard at church. It was, notwithstanding, a gross blunder in legislation. The liturgy ought to have been translated, and the Bible too, into Irish. Little settled and civilised as the country was, great good might have been done by taking religion out of the foreign dialect which had hitherto mocked the people; especially at a time when their connexion with Rome was broken, and schemes to renew it had not been effectively set on foot. Unfortunately this was not done until such schemes had begun to convulse the island. In 1571, however, Nicholas Walsh, son of a Protestant Irish bishop, but educated academically at Cambridge, being then chancellor of St. Patrick's, in conjunction with John Kerney, treasurer of that church, introduced Irish types, got an order from government for the printing of the Common Prayer into the Irish language, and another for the reading of this liturgy, and the preaching of a sermon in Irish, in the several shire-towns. In 1577,

this judicious and excellent man was appointed bishop of Ossory, and he was afterwards employed, together with his friend Kerney, and Nehemiah Donellan, eventually archbishop of Tuam, upon an Irish translation of the New Testament. This work was published in 1603; Mant, 293. Wales is an evidence of the advantage gained by an appeal sufficiently early, to the popular understanding, by means of vernacular religious formularies. That country became completely Protestant. Perhaps, indeed, the policy that rendered it so, may now have a tendency to nurture its dissenting tastes. The Welsh language is undoubtedly indebted considerably for the tenacity of its hold upon the people, to its appearance as their scriptural instructor. It is, however, no longer the dialect, even of middle life. The clergy generally, though masters of it, and using it professionally both at church and in their parishes, do not speak it at home. Hence they do not think in it, and cannot be familiar with its colloquial opulence. Not so the dissenting preacher. It is, therefore, now as desirable, that the Welsh should be cautiously withdrawn from the churches, as it was once desirable to introduce it into them. Its continuance there tends to prolong its hold upon the country, which, though justly proud of such an interesting, venerable, philological relic, is gradually losing it from the superior utility of English. Perhaps another century will render Welsh, like Cornish, no longer vernacular. When that change is accomplished, a great advantage will be gone from dissenting preachers, and the church may resume that hold upon the country, which she once had, from using a language universally intelligible, but which she has now, in a great measure, lost, probably, from continuing the use of that language in places where it is not absolutely necessary; all above the lowest, and many of them too, making more or less use of another tongue.

inconsistency, and a favourable opportunity for enlightening the Irish peasantry was most inconsiderately thrown away.

§ 7. The act of supremacy produced very little apparent effect in Ireland. No Marian English bishop would commit himself to it; the only one whom it did not strip of his preferment being Kitchen of Llandaff, upon whom it was not pressed. The Irish episcopal bench discovered no such tenacity. Dowdall of Armagh died three months before Elizabeth's accession, and his see had not been filled up. Thus an exile for conscience' sake under Edward, was not again ready to oppose the government with every advantage of position. From his uncompromising adherence to Romanism in former times, the late primate would undoubtedly have clung to it once more, and his example might have had considerable weight. His opportune death, however, made the first example come from Curwen of Dublin, an able man, but a thorough time-server, and hence no great credit to any cause, especially as even his morals appear to labour under some shade of suspicion.¹ He complied again, and all the prelacy of Ireland, with only two exceptions, Leverous of Kildare, and Walsh of Meath, like him, now solemnly admitted the crown's ecclesiastical prerogatives. These two bishops were deprived of their sees.² Of the inferior clergy, too, the great majority conformed. Nor was the laity behind in this general defection from Rome.³ Few absented themselves from church, and a disposition to do this, whenever it occurred, found a ready corrective in the strict enforcement of the pecuniary penalty which it incurred.⁴ The necessity for this severity, and other indications of Romish partialities, discovered, indeed, plainly that Ireland had far less of the Protestant spirit, than the sister-

¹ Loftus, then archbishop of Armagh, wrote of Curwen to Abp. Parker, that he 'laboured under open crimes,' shameful to speak of, though he was not ashamed to commit them. (Strype's *Parker*, i. 221.) Loftus himself eventually became Curwen's successor at Dublin, preferring a step lower in rank, with the security of a metropolis, to an unprotected residence in a country town, exposed to the outrages which remote parts of Ireland had ordinarily witnessed, and which he had recently had experience of in the rebellion of Shane O'Neil. He might have had an eye to this translation, when he wrote to Abp. Parker, and hence have been willing to make the worst of reports to Curwen's disadvantage. But such reports are seldom altogether without foundation.

² Bp. Leverous appears merely to have refused the oath of supremacy, being allowed to live for a time with the earl of Desmond, and afterwards to keep a school at Limerick. Bishop Walsh preached both against the queen's supremacy, and against the Common Prayer. He was imprisoned, and afterwards banished. He died at Alcalá in 1577, and was buried in a Cistercian monas-

tery there, being a monk of that order. Besides these two bishops, who were deprived, two more have been considered to have voluntarily resigned their sees, on account of their Romish predilections. But Bp. Mant has shaken the credibility of this statement.

³ 'The laity everywhere frequented the churches; multitudes of priests adopted the prescribed changes, and continued to officiate in their former cures.' (Phelan, 120.) 'The adherents of the Romish church in Ireland resorted to the parish-churches, where the English service was used, during a great part, if not the whole, of queen Elizabeth's reign.' (Mant, 259.) 'Until this time' (1604) 'the Papists had generally attended divine service in the churches, and were known by the name of Church-Papists.' *Ibid.* 348.

⁴ 'Many came to church rather than they would pay the tax, which was accurately collected. At first they went to mass in the morning, and to church in the afternoon; but afterwards, to prevent that evasion, a roll of the housekeepers' names in every parish was called over by the church-wardens.' *Ibid.* 271.

country.¹ Both, however, there can be no doubt, would have gradually risen completely superior to Romish prepossessions, had not the interested views and angry passions of man prolonged the papal reign. Its overthrow would not, indeed, in that case, have been attributable to the calm process of conviction, but rather to external force, or, as it may be said, to persecution, in a great proportion of instances. It should, however, be recollected, that religious parties in the sixteenth century were no petitioners for toleration. Whether they were a majority or a minority of the population, they sought nothing short of enforcing in all quarters a complete conformity to their own views, and were universally prepared for establishing this by force. It was, therefore, sufficiently reasonable to give the Irish nation an opportunity of becoming acquainted with Protestant opinions; which it could not have without their admission into all the churches of the country. Especially was Elizabeth's government justified in thus appealing to the understandings of the people, because the innovations which it sanctioned were founded on the written word of God, whereas the principles and usages which it undermined and forbade were traceable only to the uncertain traditions of men. These Romish peculiarities laboured still, besides, under an embarrassing deficiency even of mere human authority. They had long gained possession of the western church, but inquiry had shown many of them to have had no such advantage from the first, and some of them to have had it only from a date comparatively modern. Whether they would retain possession too, even among those who valued them, was uncertain. They were actually upon their trial. The council of Trent, which had long been engaged upon the investigation of their claims to confidence, was yet in deliberation. Elizabeth, however, was clearly free from any obligation to wait for the tardy decisions of a packed council of Italians and Spaniards. Her government was entitled to judge of religious questions for her own dominions from the light of Scripture, and of competent theological advice. Nor is it inexcusable for adopting the same exclusive principles of enforcing its own convictions, which all parties considered a sacred duty in that age.

§ 8. The English government, under both Henry and Elizabeth, had formed plans for the civil amelioration of Ireland, as well as the ecclesiastical. The country was to be moulded, by the blending of all its inhabitants into a homogeneous society, into a form like that of England, and of other kingdoms equally advanced. This design, however, could not be realised without sacrifices on the part of many families, which they were utterly averse from making. The principal families within the Pale must give up their established monopoly of such advantages as the colonial executive had to bestow;² the chief-

¹ In 1564, a proclamation was issued by the lord lieutenant, prohibiting the meetings of friars and popish priests, in Dublin, and ordering that none of them should lie within the city-gates. Mant, 271.

² 'Thus the Pale had become a sort of corporation, and its principal families had acquired that corrupt and illiberal spirit, which too often belongs to a small privileged community.' Phelan, 122.

tains without the Pale must descend, as they esteemed it, from a sort of savage sovereignty to the tame dignity of a civilised peerage. When both parties found the prospect of these alterations in their several conditions daily becoming more clear, they were violently dissatisfied. The first outbreak of their disgust and impatience was in Ulster, where the O'Neil family was recognised among the aboriginal Irish as invested with an authority akin to the royal, if not identical with it. The chieftain of that house had veiled his semi-barbarous dignity, in Henry's time, under the earldom of Tyrone, and taken the oath of supremacy; his object and that of others in his condition, then being to humble the hierarchy. But a master having been effectually found for the bishops, in the prince, neither O'Neil nor any other chieftain had any thought of accepting one for himself in the same quarter, and accordingly, when England was evidently bent upon reducing his whole order to this alternative, the existing Ulster potentate resolved upon setting an example of resistance. John, or Shane O'Neil, was his name. He was the eldest legitimate son of that individual who had been created Earl of Tyrone; but Henry had been persuaded, when he granted that peerage, to name Matthew, Tyrone's elder, but illegitimate son, as the next successor to it. Shane's adventurous impetuosity disdained, however, such interference with his own better-founded expectations. He made an overpowering party in the province, and was acknowledged its chieftain by the law of tanistry.¹ He now sought to seize the country which owned his family's authority, by force of arms, and in 1560 he made it the theatre of war.² Elizabeth's haughty and resolute spirit could not endure this insolence of a wild Irish chieftain. She promptly sent five hundred foot over from England, and some cavalry being raised in Ireland to join them, Shane soon found himself unable to keep the field. Hence he not only threw down his arms, but also promised to wait upon the queen in England, being evidently anxious to obtain her authority for assuming the peerage, that he might thus acquire every species of right to the chieftaincy which he had succeeded in appropriating.³ Within about twelve months, he kept his promise,

¹ 'Taking upon himself the title of Oneal, by no other election than a wild cast of his shoe over his head.' (Cambden's *Elizabeth*, apud Kennet's *Complete Hist. of Engl.* Lond. 1706, ii. 385.) This might be some form used at his election, but O'Neil himself referred his position to a regular election, under the law of tanistry, in his personal address to Elizabeth, when he waited upon her, according to his promise. 'The laws of God and man,' he said, 'had made him the undoubted heir, as being his father's eldest son, born in lawful wedlock, and entitled O-neal, by the joint consent of the peers and commons, according to the law of that country, called *Tanistry*, by which a man grown is preferred before a child, and the uncle before the nephew, whose grand-

father outlives the father.' *Ibid.* 391.

² Cambden attributes his outbreak to apprehensions of legal violence. 'For fear the laws should call him to account for the murder of Matthew, Lord Dungannon, his base brother, falsely supposed to be legitimate, for depriving his father, who soon after broke his heart, of his government.' *Ibid.* 385.

³ 'After some slight skirmishes, when he found himself unable to cope with the English, and that he was grown odious to his party, and was likewise opposed by Surly-Boy (an Hebridian Scot), James Macconell, and Odonel, he threw down his arms at the intreaty of his kinsman, the earl of Kildare, and promised to come to England and crave the queen's mercy.' *Ibid.*

appearing at the English court with the same sort of savage parade, that might now be expected at St. James's, with an Indian chief from the forests of Canada.¹ The exhibition proved as amusing as strange sights always are, and the record of it may serve to expose the folly, or worse, of commenting upon the Irish transactions of that day, as if they occurred in a civilised nation. Elizabeth received her wild visiter with the kindness that she had in store for almost everybody. But she was not surprised out of any of her habitual firmness and discernment. She questioned O'Neil as to his assumptions, and let him go back to Ireland without any confirmation of his claims. Though, probably, much disappointed by this failure, he seems to have been upon the whole pleased with his English visit, and by way of some return he made strenuous and successful exertions against the Scottish marauders who infested the north of Ireland. Having thus both ingratiated himself with the English government, and become leader of a considerable force, well-practised in arms, his savage passions broke completely loose. All the petty chieftains around were brought under his insolent yoke. Hatred of the primate made him burn Armagh, not even sparing the cathedral.² O'Donel, his nearest neighbour of any importance, he stripped of his land, turned him out of doors, and committed a rape upon his wife. The English were now driven to interfere; but O'Neil treated their first preparations with contempt, and set up the standard of rebellion. He was, however, soon persuaded to take it down again, and even to surrender his son as a hostage for his future good behaviour. Elizabeth entertained hopes of conciliating him by cancelling the patent in favour of his illegitimate half-brother; but Shane scorned the tardy concession, raised a large force, declared himself *the* O'Neil, sovereign of Ulster, and offered the superiority over Ireland to the queen of Scots. Effectual means of putting him down were now necessarily used by the government, and these, after some vicissitudes, completely succeeding, he was driven by despair to take refuge with about fifty clansmen, among the Scots then lingering in Ulster. They received him with apparent cordiality, but a band of savage marauders were not likely to forgive the slaughter which he had recently committed upon their comrades, when he was acting as the queen's auxiliary. They upbraided him accordingly, over their cups, with his cruel usage of

¹ 'Now came Shan Oneal out of Ireland, to perform the promise he had made a year ago, with a guard of Galloglasses, armed with hatchets, all bareheaded, their hair flowing in locks upon their shoulders, on which were yellow surplices, dyed with saffron, or stained with urine, with long sleeves, short coats, and thrum jackets; which caused as much staring and gaping among the English people, as if they had come from China or America.' Camden, 391.

² In 1566. The church has been represented as 'utterly destroyed,' but Bp. Mant says that this language 'must be taken with

some qualification, as the building, which still exists, is evidently in part the production of an earlier age.' 'The cause assigned for this outrage was, *that he did it, lest the English should lodge therein*: for which fact, the sentence of excommunication was pronounced against him by Archbishop Loftus, then lord primate of all Ireland, and by the clergy of his diocese.' (*Hist. of the Ch. of Ireland*, 302.) Richard Creagh, the titular primate, was equally enraged by this devastation of an edifice, which he calculated upon recovering for himself, and he too excommunicated O'Neil. Phelan, 134.

their friends; and an altercation urging him into some offensive personalities, they seem to have considered him as entitled no longer to benefit from the laws of hospitality, and he was murdered with most of his party.¹ Such was the beginning of the wars in Ireland, attributed to religion; and such was the first champion produced by the papal church, as it is thought, in that country.²

§ 9. By the suppression of this revolt, Ireland was not pacified. Ulster, indeed, had gained a temporary relief from the disorders under which it ordinarily suffered. But Munster was the theatre of war. The two principal chieftains of that province, the earls of Ormond and Desmond, were at feud as to the limits of their several jurisdictions. It is true, that attempts had been made under Henry VIII. not only to merge the chief in the peer, but also to convert territorial rights into patrimonial estates. When the Irish chiefs acknowledged the crown's ecclesiastical prerogatives, they resigned their claims over the districts in which they were the acknowledged rulers and proprietors, into the king's hands, and these lands were formally re-conveyed to them, under the royal letters-patent, as private inheritances. It is not improbable, that a desire of these grants might have influenced them in making their submissions. According to aboriginal Irish law, the chief was recognised as head-proprietor of all the land within his sept,³ but then he had only a life-interest in it. At his death, it really reverted to the tribe, which was, indeed, most likely to acknowledge the next heir as his successor, but which might set that person aside in favour of another. He was treated as a candidate whose claims required approval from twelve chosen judges, before they could be admitted.⁴ Hence after the great chieftains had accepted royal titles to their lands, there was ample room for denying any importance to the grants. The surrendering parties had compromised posterity. The sept, however, which really claimed an ultimate ownership of the land, was not inclined to lose all hold upon it under feudal laws of primogeniture, to which it had never consented. Thus the Munster earls had abundant materials at command for convulsing the districts in which they lived. They had only to take, or suffer to be taken for them, the popular views of territorial rights, in order to gain enthusiastic support for any of their selfish schemes. At length, the government

¹ Such is Cambden's account. Dr. Lingard says, 'the Irish chieftain was basely assassinated by his new friends, at the instigation of Piers, an English officer.' (*Hist. Engl.* viii. 127.)

² 'A man he was who had stained his hands with blood, and dealt in all the pollutions of unchaste embraces; and so scandalous a glutton and drunkard was he beside, that he would often lie up to the chin in dirt to cool the feverish heats of his intemperate lusts.' Cambden, 409.

³ 'By a custom, which seems to have extended from the Himalaya mountains to the Atlantic, he was sole proprietor of all the

land in his sept: the clansmen held their portions during the pleasure of their chief.' Phelan, iv.

⁴ 'The surrender made by my father to Henry VIII., and the second grant of it from the king to him, signified just nothing, forasmuch as he had no estate to make over beyond his own life, nor could he surrender it, but by the consent of the nobility and people, who had conferred on him the honour of O'neal. Such letters-patents are moreover insignificant, unless there was a certain heir of the family acknowledged by twelve men: which, in this case, was never done.' O'Neil's speech to Elizabeth, Cambden, 391.

was aroused to the necessity of interference, and the two litigants received a summons to appear before the council-board in England, and state their respective cases. This course was, however, abandoned, as involving questions difficult of decision at such a distance, and the lord deputy received instructions to adjudicate. The earls again prepared for war; but Ormond, willing to try less hazardous means, entered into communication with the queen's ministers, and a well-executed surprise having sent Desmond into an English prison, Munster enjoyed once more, for a time, its average portion of tranquillity.¹ But such temporary calms had never lasted long enough to civilise the country. Its population had been constantly exercised with animosity and contention. Hence alien enemies of England could calculate pretty safely upon the sister-island as a vulnerable point. Its dissensions might arise, as they did, out of cupidity in the great, and senseless antipathies in the vulgar. They served, whatever were their origin, to keep the nation incapable of regular industry,² ignorant and careless of civilised comforts, prone to the wild excitement of warlike adventure, and hostile to the distant English government, because it interfered occasionally, though feebly, with individual selfishness and desolating violence.

§ 10. The foreign country that first entertained hopes of turning the distracted and uncivilised state of Ireland to its own advantage, was France; which, when England seemed likely to change its almost nominal superiority into a real one, received overtures from some of the alarmed chieftains. They offered to transfer their allegiance, such as it was, from the English crown to the French; provided that the pope would consent, as there could be no doubt he would, unless continental politics should interfere; the offer being made in Edward's time, consequently, after Henry's rupture with Rome. This prospect appeared so tempting, that when John de Monluc, bishop of Valence, was sent ambassador to Mary of Guise, regent of Scotland, he received instructions to take Ireland in his way home, and make observations as to the feasibility of the plans proposed by the Irish chiefs.³ Whatever his report might be, France had hardly received

¹ Camden, 410.

² 'The barbarian Moor, the Moorish Spaniard, the Turk, and the Irishman, are the least industrious and most sluggish livers under the sun.' (Lithgow's *Account of Ireland*, in 1619, *apud* Turner's *Modern Hist. Engl.* Lond. 1829, iv. 393.) The Irish, however, now do a great part of the most laborious work in English towns, and those who employ them, speak well of them. The idleness, therefore, which Lithgow saw, was merely produced by the wretched state of their social institutions. There is no reason to doubt that if Ireland had been delivered, soon after the English came, from the domestic tyranny under which its people had been immemorably impoverished and barbarised, they would have been found fully upon a level with contemporary Europeans in industry, and in every other valuable quality.

³ 'To know more particularly the motions and likelihood of the offers made by Oneal, Odoneel, Odocart, and Callock, willing to shake off the yoke of England, and become subject to the king of France; providing that he would help procure the pope's gift of Ireland, and then send to their help 2,000 hacbutiers, 200 light horsemen, and 4 canon.' (*Sir James Melvil's Memoirs*, 8.) Sir James, then a boy of 14, was with the bishop, little to the advantage of the right reverend diplomat's reputation. At the 'great dark tower,' in which Odocart (probably O'Dogherty) lived, and where Monluc was entertained, were found two friars, fled from England, who remarked with great uneasiness his persecuting attentions to the host's daughter, anxious as she was to escape from them. Her disgust being likely to be known, and inconveniently resented by her father,

it when a coolness sprang up with Rome,¹ and she long continued, afterwards, from domestic difficulties, unable to enter upon a distant and hazardous enterprise: hence the overtures from Ireland merely served as an introduction, on a future occasion, to such intercourse with her turbulent aristocracy as kept up its hopes of exchanging a superior at hand for one at a distance. This kind of communication was, however, entered into with considerable spirit, greatly to the embarrassment and annoyance of the English government, which complained of it, in 1572, as inconsistent with the peaceful relations then subsisting between the two governments.² But Rome was the continental power most steadily intent upon wounding England through her Irish dominions. Two Jesuits³ had been sent to Ireland previously to Monluc's visit, and they, probably, suggested to the native chieftainry, that as the English power had been originally introduced under colour of the papal authority, so it might now be driven out of the island by the same device. By this means, it would be easy, as before, both to secure clerical support, and to work upon popular prejudice. But, although the ground may be prepared for national movements by Jesuits, or other suitable agents of no great personal importance, decisive measures require appliances which cannot always be commanded. Hence it was not until Hugh Buoncompagno, officially designated Gregory XIII., occupied the papal throne, that Roman designs against the tranquillity of Ireland broke forth in overt acts. That pontiff was continually urging both the courts of France and Spain, from his first acquisition of the tiara, to strike at the vitals of England, through her Irish dominions.⁴ At the outset he might

the English friars naturally became uneasy under Monluc's indecent conduct, and, by way of stopping it, secretly brought him another female. This person found in his chamber-window a small glass vessel, containing some substance with a very fine smell. Thinking that it must be good eating, with all the greediness of a semi-barbarian, she 'licked it clean out.' It was a most valuable perfume, given by the Grand Seigneur to the bishop, after a diplomatic residence of two years at his court. When he found it thus disposed of, he made such an outcry as brought the household into his chamber, which was greatly amused, no less than surprised, on finding it doubly-tenanted, and witnessing the French bishop's boisterous rage. Neither his own servants, however, nor the Irish thought of anything in the affair, but its ridiculous details. Not so the woman, and the friars who introduced her. They precipitately fled. Melvil, 9.

¹ 'The bishop of Valence was sent to Rome to endeavour to oblige the pope to desert the emperor; but he returned without obtaining success in his expedition: which was the cause that the dealing betwixt the king of France and O'neel in

Ireland ceased. And in the mean time the king of France emits a proclamation, forbidding his subjects to send to Rome for any bulls, or confirmations of benefices: which, together with the agreement with England, put the pope in great fear, that France would become protestant, in despite, as Henry VIII. had lately done before.' (*Ibid.* 11.) As the pope's authority, which the chiefs had solemnly disclaimed but the other day, was now to stimulate their abused clansmen in aiding them to shake off the augmenting power of England, France's quarrel with Rome, at that juncture, necessarily deferred the business, it being unlikely that the pope would offend the emperor by pretending to confer Ireland upon a rival power. But the intended reference to Rome could not fail of making the Irish chiefs encourage, by all the means in their power, the machinations of Jesuits, and other Romish emissaries. The time might come, and that soon, when the plea of papal authority would serve their selfish ends most materially.

² Turner's *Mod. Hist.* iv. 388.

³ Salmeron and Paschasius. *Ibid.*

⁴ 'Les révoltes que la reine Elisabeth

have been actuated solely by an honest, though unenlightened, feeling of attachment to his own creed, and a genuine conviction that duty demanded of him an unsparing hostility to Elizabeth; although it must be owned, that exhortations to bloodshed and confusion indicate no high degree of that knowledge which a Christian minister professes to dispense. But as Gregory's interest in Irish affairs gained strength, it lost him all credit even for honesty. His general conduct, although far from austere pious, or moral, was decorous, but he had a son, James Buoncompagno, born to him illegitimately before he took priest's orders, of whom he was immoderately fond, and this child of shame he meant for king of Ireland.¹

§ 11. This disgraceful project was put into his head by Thomas Stukeley, an English fugitive, utterly bankrupt in character and circumstances, who took refuge at Rome after he could no longer stay either in England or Ireland. This worthless but specious and boasting adventurer, had soon wormed himself into the confidence of the late pope, Pius V., by feeding his stern, stolid bigotry, with gross abuse of Elizabeth, and sanguine pictures of the facility with which her Irish dominions might be wrested from her. Pius, however, lived long enough to see his character exposed, his money wasted, and his conspiracy baffled in a profligate attempt made upon England, but not long enough to be ready for a similar expense and infamy in Ireland. When Gregory XIII., accordingly, became master at the Vatican, Stukeley was still at hand with his Irish temptations, and as the new pope had a son, whom he would be delighted to see a king, the worthless exile found means of giving an interest to his tales that the childless old age and severe morality of the late pontiff denied. Intoxicated with the prospect of founding a sovereign family, Gregory not only pretended to create his tempter marquess of Leinster, and a double earl and double baron besides, but he also furnished him with 3,000 stand of arms, fitted out a ship of war, gave him the command of an Italian troop, either six or eight hundred strong, whom the king of Spain had engaged to pay, for the purpose of joining the discontented Irish chieftains, and making a conquest of their country. With this force, Stukeley left Civitâ Vecchia, in 1578, and steered for the Tagus. When anchored there, he found Philip gave him no cordial greeting, being disgusted at the pope's design of making Ireland into a kingdom for his own spurious offspring. He had entered into the scheme of employing Stukeley for the purpose of securing the island for himself; intending to justify the seizure of it as a reprisal for Elizabeth's assistance to his revolted subjects in the Netherlands. He was not at all averse, therefore, when the pretended marquess of Leinster expressed a wish to join Sebastian, king of Portugal, in the expedition about to sail for Morocco. Nor was this unexpected alteration in the adventurer's course wholly without a

avait à combattre en Irlande, étaient presque toujours entretenues par Rome. Le pape ne cachait pas son désir de susciter une guerre générale contre l'Angleterre.

Chaque année ses nonces négociaient à ce sujet avec Philippe II. et avec les Guise.
 Ranke, *Hist. de la Papauté*, ii. 241.

¹ Cambden, 462.

semblance of promoting his papal employer's objects. Sebastian had made a great boasting of his intended services against Protestants and Mahumedans; much to the pontiff's apparent satisfaction, as he had warmly applauded his zeal. But he never came back from Africa. He fell in battle there, as did also two Moorish kings, that fought him, and his English auxiliary Stukeley, who thus finished, as Cambden well remarks, 'the interlude of a loose life with an honest catastrophe, or conclusion.' Philip had now neither time nor money for Ireland. Every thought and every resource were urgently required for the seizure of Portugal.¹

§ 12. Success in this enterprise left him, however, within twelve months, at leisure again for Irish politics. James Fitzmaurice, brother to the earl of Desmond, tempted him importunately with pictures of the facility with which Elizabeth might be deprived of the sister-island. The *great earl* himself, as he was called, had formerly promised to abstain from any further interference in religious disputes, admitting his incompetence to judge accurately upon them,² and when released from the Tower of London, he entered into a recognisance of twenty thousand pounds for his peaceable behaviour.³ But the old feuds between his house and that of Ormond, Jesuitic sophistry, dread of English control, and the persuasions of his brother, James, who had neither character nor fortune at stake, impelled him to stir up secretly a war in Munster. The desperate and perfidious folly upon which he thus entered, was to be cloaked and countenanced by religious considerations. James Fitzmaurice obtained from the pope a small sum of money, a consecrated banner, and letters of recommendation to Philip.⁴ In Spain, he collected about eighty soldiers, natives of the country, and a few exiles, partly Irish, partly English.

¹ Cambden, 462. The first agent in this Irish rebellion is thus described in the *Execution of Justice*, attributed to Burghley: 'Out of Ireland ran away one Thomas Stukeley, a defamed person almost through all Christendom, and a faithless beast rather than a man, fleeing first out of England for notable piracies, and out of Ireland for treacheries not pardonable.' (3) Cambden describes him as a 'lewd, profuse, and vaunting rascal, who, after spending his estate, had fled into Ireland, being disappointed of the hopes he had of being steward of Wexford,' &c. 430.

² 'The *great earl*, as he is called by the Irish annalists, had promised the government, upon his withdrawing from O'Neil's confederacy, that as he had no knowledge in learning, and was ignorant of what should be done for the furtherance of religion in Munster, he would aid and maintain whatever might be appointed by commissioners nominated for that purpose.' Phelan, 157.

³ 'Which he acknowledged that he had justly forfeited.' *Ibid.* 158.

⁴ 'The same James, who, a while before, falling upon his knees before Perrot, president of Munster, had, with great lamentations and humble intreaties, begged his pardon, and most religiously vowed his fidelity and obedience to the queen. This man, I say, who was never well but in troubles, had withdrawn himself into France, promising the king that, if he would assist him, he would unite all Ireland to the sceptre of France, and restore the Romish religion in that isle.' (Cambden, 472.) He, probably, shaped his course first towards France, because that court had formerly been tempted with hopes of acquiring Ireland. It was, however, now inclined to make no efforts for the purpose, and Fitzmaurice, becoming importunate, was at last treated with derision. He then went to Spain. Philip referred him to the pope, and his suit at Rome being warmly seconded both by Sanders and the Jesuit Allen, Gregory helped to fit him out, and gave him letters to the king of Spain.

He was accompanied by Sanders, the great authority for Romish accounts of the English reformation, who bore a regular commission as papal legate, and by Allen, an Irish Jesuit. The party landed at St. Mary Wick, or Smerwick, in Kerry, in July, 1579, and immediately seizing a piece of ground for the building of a fort, which, to keep up appearances, was formally consecrated, it spent the following winter there. Nothing can show more clearly the ordinary impotence of the English government in most parts of Ireland, than this wintering of a force in itself so thoroughly contemptible, especially as the three vessels which brought over the invaders were taken almost immediately by an English ship of war, that happened accidentally to be near. Within the country too, there was little appearance of co-operation. Two of the Desmond family, indeed, speedily joined their kinsman and his foreign friends, but the earl himself made a show of disapproving the enterprise, and even mustered his people under pretence of resisting it. He managed, however, to prevent the earl of Clancarty, who was coming to join him, from executing that intention, and in spite of his oaths and protestations of loyalty, it became evident enough that he was really a party to the rebellion. His open patronage of it was delayed, until Ormond, the ancient rival of his house, was appointed president of Munster. That nobleman had already ingratiated himself with the English government, by counteracting the traitorous movements, first of his own brothers,¹ afterwards of the Desmonds. He was now invested with a paramount authority over the district in which he had hitherto been only a competitor for power, and he was called upon still further to gail his rival by demanding a personal interview with him. Desmond had excused himself, in letters transmitted by his wife, from waiting upon Pelham, lord justice (Drury, lord deputy, being lately dead, and a successor not having been yet provided), but as he still was unprepared for disclaiming his allegiance, he could not refuse to see Ormond, however cordially he might hate him. He was required to procure the arrest of Sanders, and the caption of the handful of foreign invaders, to act against his brother, and submit himself in every particular. On these conditions his suspicious conduct was to be overlooked. If he rejected them, he was to be declared a traitor, and treated accordingly. The unhappy earl yet sought, by equivocation and delay, to escape from this alternative; but the obvious

¹ Edmund and Peter Butler, in 1569. Cambden says, that they 'grew too big to be restrained within the bounds of law, insulted their neighbours in Munster, and destroyed the queen's good subjects with fire and sword.' (421.) Such men did not require any difference of religion to hate their sovereign: their real quarrel was with any controlling force. But as their outrages rendered them more than ordinarily anxious for popular support, they were willing to stand forth as Romish champions, and having formed a confede-

racy with other chieftains in that part of the country, the whole movement became of sufficient importance to attract the notice of Philip, who was really zealous for Romanism, and whose anxiety to appropriate Ireland is at least equally certain. He sent, accordingly, John de Mendoza privately into Ireland to see what could be done; but the earl of Ormond arriving at the same time from England, his two brothers were persuaded by him to submit themselves. They were, however, taken into custody, but never brought to trial.

impolicy of allowing him any further opportunity to gain time, precipitated the government into a formal denunciation of him as a traitor, in the beginning of November, 1579. Being now hotly pursued, and reduced to considerable difficulty, he publicly professed himself a defender of the catholic faith, and invited the lord justice to join him; a ridiculous proposal which was received with a laugh, but which his weak head, being flushed by a trifling success, might consider as a very proper demonstration of importance.¹

§ 13. In the following February, that of 1580, Sanders addressed a letter to the Irish nobility, in which Elizabeth is most scurrilously handled.² But his mission continued, notwithstanding, to wear a very unpromising appearance, being greeted but slenderly with native support, although papal indulgences bade high for it among all who lived in fear of purgatory. Nor did the Romish party find its prospects much more satisfactory, even on the arrival, at the latter end of September, of San Giuseppe, an Italian officer, at the head of seven hundred men; although there came besides five thousand stand of arms and a rich military chest. This reinforcement appears to have been chiefly made up of Italian *banditti*, pardoned on condition of fighting in Ireland for the papal cause.³ The invaders were enabled easily to effect a landing, the English admiral employed to watch the coast having withdrawn, because he then did not expect an enemy. San Giuseppe immediately set about fortifying himself, and he called his work the *Fort del Ore*. He soon, however, found himself so pressed by the lord deputy, and the earl of Ormond, while he received no succour either from Desmond, or from the continent, that he became alarmed, and hastily surrendered at discretion. The queen's forces had long been most irregularly paid, and a body of them that was marched into the fort, finding a crowd of disorderly sailors already there, sought an indemnity in the plunder of these unhappy foreigners, who were inhumanly put to the sword. Disreputable as were the victims of this outrage, Elizabeth felt it as a stain upon her soldiers. Hence it gave her great concern and displeasure. Of Sanders, the fate is uncertain; but he is known to have died in concealment before the end of 1580. The earl of Desmond himself eluded pursuit during nearly three years, but he passed a miserable life. His days were generally spent alone, lurking in caverns, or other unsuspected retreats. At night he was usually joined by a few faithful followers,⁴ who brought him such sustenance as they could any way

¹ He took Youghal without resistance, and his clansmen made a sad figure as soldiers in a papal war, pillaging the implements of Romish worship found there with as little hesitation as anything else that came in their way. This has been represented by Romanists as a reason of Desmond's eventual misfortunes. (Phelan, 203.) As Youghal was strongly fortified, an English garrison would, probably, have rendered it secure; but the mayor refused to admit one, for which he was hanged

before his own door, when, shortly after, Ormond retook the place. Cambden, 474.

² It may be seen in Ellis's *Original Letters*, second series, iii. 95.

³ See *Gentleman's Magazine* for June, 1849, p. 591.

⁴ Who 'had barbarously vowed to forswear God before they would forsake him.' (Cambden, 495.) This is the true spirit of clanship, and an indication not to be misunderstood of the state which Irish society had reached at that time.

procure. One day they seized some cows, and the owner getting assistance from a neighbouring fort, ventured upon an active search after his property. The animals were tracked to a glen through which the party proceeded until near midnight, when a light was seen glimmering through some trees. Towards this the officer led his men, and finding a cabin he entered it.¹ An old man was lying before the fire, from whom, probably, nothing satisfactory could be learnt, as he was violently assaulted, and his arm was almost cut off. He then cried out, 'I am the earl of Desmond!' But this appeal gained him no pity.² He was run through in several places, and his head being severed from the body, it was sent over to England, and placed upon London Bridge, according to the usage in cases of high treason.³

§ 14. Soon after Desmond's death, Ireland gained a strong and fair executive, the chief thing of which it has ordinarily been in want. Sir John Perrot, natural son, it was thought, of Henry VIII., became lord deputy, and administered the laws with that stern impartiality which respected neither race nor station, and which reduced completely to their just dimensions those ferocious, wily, selfish local tyrants, among whom the country had been immemorably parcelled. The result of this administrative vigour was a degree of tranquillity quite unknown hitherto in Ireland. But although the great mass of the people, both of indigenious and of English extraction, did ample justice to a government which, for the first time, knew no distinctions but between right and wrong doers, none could deny the deputy's severity, nor could such as felt the weight of it keep down a thirst for vengeance. At length Perrot, whose temper was evidently austere and hasty, grew weary of the animosities that thickened around him, and solicited his recall. His enemies pursued him into his retirement, and raking up some offensive and harsh language⁴ upon

¹ Phelan, 168.

² Cox says, that Desmond was alone, those who were with him having run away when they found the soldiers approaching. The attacking party was led by an Irishman, named Kelly, who had been brought up among the English, and would have spared the earl, when he discovered his quality; but seeing that the bleeding from his arm made his recovery impossible, he went on to despatch him. *Hist. Irel.* i. 367.

³ Cambden, 495. Dr. Lingard says that it was Kelly of Moriarty who struck off his head, and he writes as if Desmond had only time enough to discover himself. He also speaks of the earl's appearance as 'venerable.' Dr. Phelan too mentions his 'dignified aspect.' These things make the account much more picturesque. But Cambden's more probable tale makes it seem that there was a scuffle. As for Desmond's appearance, it is not likely to have been very striking. He was evidently a weak man.

Such people may be self-possessed from the habitual consciousness of external advantages, but commanding faces they never have. The truth appears to be, that the soldiers treated this like an ordinary case of cattle-stealing, and finding an old man under very suspicious circumstances, who might be either insolent or uncommunicative, they treated him as they would any other such person so found at that time and in that country.

⁴ Perrot's coarse expressions about Elizabeth may be seen in Cox (i. 387). Unfortunately, that queen, though a very superior person, was not proof against a report of such liberties. Perhaps, however, few people would be, especially the great, whose ears, rarely meeting any other language than that of subserviency and flattery, are little prepared for the insulting familiarities with which their names are often associated, like the names of all the world besides, behind their backs.

Elizabeth and her ministers, which he had vented under disappointment and irritation, he was convicted of high treason. After a few months he died broken-hearted, or, some said, poisoned, in the Tower.¹ His withdrawal from Ireland was a signal for a new scene in the miserable drama, which had so long found a theatre upon her smiling surface. Among those who distinguished themselves on the royal side, in Desmond's rebellion, was Hugh O'Neil, son of the lord Dungannon, illegitimately born to the earl of Tyrone, but declared his heir in Henry the Eighth's patent of nobility. The young Hugh had the great advantage of an English education, and evidently possessed personal qualities fitted both for insinuation and action. But his uncle Shane, in striving for the chieftaincy of Ulster, had so effectually blazoned his father's base birth, that a very serious prejudice against him pervaded the northern province. He seemed, however, thoroughly devoted to the English, and he really possessed such means of aiding their government as rendered him an ally of great importance. Hence Elizabeth first gave him the earldom of Tyrone, and afterwards, the extensive territorial rights which his grandfather had possessed. These concessions he viewed as mere stepping-stones; but his time for throwing off the mask was not come, and he yet strove to appear one of the most devoted of Elizabeth's subjects. Ulster showed symptoms of relapsing into its former turbulence. Tyrone received an application to aid in restoring tranquillity. He readily promised his services, but required permission to raise and train six companies, which he might always have at command, in case any disturbance should occur. He would maintain this force himself. The required permission was given, and the six companies were raised. But they had no sooner become disciplined soldiers, than the men were severally sent home, and others took their places, who were trained in like manner. Thus all his clansmen, useful for the field, were gradually initiated in the arts of scientific warfare.² Such suspicious movements could not wholly escape observation; but the chieftain, by descending at all times when

¹ Perrot, however, did some disservice to the English by recruiting for the army in Ireland, probably, to spare the queen's exchequer. 'Till this time the Englishmen had very easy wars in Ireland; 800 foot and 300 horse were held an invincible army. Randolph, with 600 English, easily discomfited O'Neal with 4,000 Irish. Collier, in the year 1571, with one single company, defeated a thousand Hebridians in Connaught. Three hundred horse overthrew the Butler with a great multitude of rebels. And (to omit other like instances) two companies of foot won in one day above twenty castles from the Irish. But after they were, by Perrot's command, exercised daily at home, taught the use of their weapons, and to discharge their guns at a mark, so that they might be the more ready for service

against the Hebridians, and had afterwards been bred up in the Netherland war, and learned the ways of fortifications; they then troubled the English (as we shall see after) with a more difficult war.' (Cambden, 542.) The Irish, therefore, in Elizabeth's early years, were like the uncivilised nations of modern times, no match whatever for the troops of a nation more advanced. This is a great additional reflexion upon the English government for suffering their wild independence during so long a time; and it is also a rebuke to those who would lay much stress upon their religious convictions at that time. The clansmen, it seems likely, would have turned Protestants, if their chiefs had seen any prospect of advantage in setting them the example.

² Phelan, 172.

it suited him to the most abject submissions, and most perfidious representations, contrived to keep himself in a condition to beard the government whenever it could be safely done. At length he renounced his peerage, at least tacitly, by claiming to be *the* O'Neil, the lord of Ulster; and entering into correspondence with Spain, he assumed an attitude of defiance. Elizabeth, who had become impatient under the very mention of Ireland, was now driven to some decisive step. In July, 1595, Tyrone was proclaimed a traitor, and this show of vigour, joined to military movements of some account, again brought him, with other of the Ulster chiefs, to tender hypocritical submissions. In the following January attempts were made to pacify their unhappy country by means of a formal accommodation, and then, for the first time, the rebel captains brought forward the question of religion.¹ But although they universally claimed liberty of conscience, yet two of them, M'Mahon and M'Cauley, required full possession of *all* the revenues within their respective limits, the ecclesiastical being specifically mentioned: such was the tenderness of these men for the future prospects of that church which had now professedly awakened their tardy zeal.² It is worthy of remark, also, that among the conditions offered to the rebels, was the admission of sheriffs into their counties:³ a plain demonstration that hatred and fear of law, with all those restraints of civilised society which follow in its train, not honest Romish prepossessions, were the real causes of their rebellion. Their leader, Tyrone, indeed, had rendered himself rather conspicuous in his compliance with calls to Protestant worship,⁴ and there can hardly be a doubt that, if England had been Romish, these Irish lords of misrule would have found cogent reasons for siding either with Luther or Calvin. Their hopes, however, of foreign succour all centred in Spain, the most bigoted of Romish countries, and its king was to cloak his ambitious designs upon Ireland, by pretending to receive it from the pope, its superior lord, who reclaimed it from Elizabeth as forfeited by heresy. Thus hatred of the country, which sought to restrain their wild excesses, anxiety to gratify Spain, and a provident care to cloak selfish injustice under colourable pretences, all impelled these Irish chieftains to take up a position as religious champions. The miserable followers, too,

¹ 'A very pleasant conceit, when religion was a thing that had not hitherto fallen under any consideration in that kingdom, and the malcontents themselves had so little troubled their heads about it, that this was the very first time they had made use of it, as a medium to strengthen their party.' Camden, 589.

² 'As for the business of alienating the church-lands, her answer' (the queen's) 'was, that she had never willingly and knowingly granted to any man, nor would she hereafter grant, the liberty of seizing on the revenues of the church.' *Ibid.* 590.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ 'Your majesty has heard, (says Lee,)

that he and his lady are papists, and foster seminarists. True it is that he is affected that way, but less hurtfully and dangerously than some of the greatest in the English pale: for when he is with the state, he will accompany the lord deputy to the church, and home again, and will stay to hear service and sermon; they, as soon as they have brought the lord deputy to the church-door, depart as if they were wild cats: but he, in my conscience, with good conference, would be reformed; for he hath only one little cub of an English priest, by whom he is seduced for want of his friends' access to him, who might otherwise uphold him.' Phelan, 177.

whom they and their fathers had impoverished, barbarised, and oppressed in every substantial particular, but who were not aware of the hostile influence that really ground them to the dust, might find venom added to their hereditary hatred of everything English, and enthusiasm added to their own clannish attachments, if they believed England an enemy to true religion, their chieftainry a powerful instrument for its protection. Thus when the sixteenth century, which laid the foundation of existing public opinion everywhere in Europe, closed upon Ireland, it left upon her populace a rooted antipathy to Protestantism. Ignorant people had been taught by selfish men, for ends quite unconnected with religion, to confound Romish peculiarities with the Catholic faith, and this absurd persuasion, constantly receiving a tinge of malignity from social evils and political disaffection, has worked itself into the vitals of inferior Irish society. Although Elizabeth lived, accordingly, just long enough to see the termination of her troubles in the sister-island, by the suppression of Tyrone's rebellion, she left no additional soundness in the public mind there.¹ Rather, perhaps, the reverse. England had been found an over-match, but the difficulties in the way of consolidating her power, and the superior attractions of continental politics, joined to the lingering hold of Irish chieftainry, the uncivilised habits of the people, and the crafty exertions of an indigent sectarian priesthood, prevented her from following up past successes with the vigour that was urgently required. Hence arose a necessity for that violence which planted Ireland, in the seventeenth century, with an aristocracy alien in blood and religion to her indigenous population, filling the country with claims, prejudices, and animosities that distract it up to the present hour.

§ 15. One of Sir John Perrot's most promising efforts for the amelioration of Ireland, was to found a college in Dublin, that hence might flow streams of sound knowledge into every part of the country. That able viceroy had come into Ireland with instructions to consider how St. Patrick's church, and its endowments, could be made available for this useful purpose. He found himself, however, unable to carry the plan into execution. Adam Loftus, then both archbishop of Dublin and lord chancellor, was raising a family out of the revenues of that cathedral, and he exerted himself to prevent any new appropriation of them.² In his vindication it is alleged, that, if the project had taken effect, the see of Dublin would have been injuriously curtailed of means to reward clerical merit;³ which would

¹ 'O'Neil, who had never acted vigorously with or under his continental allies, and who, on one occasion, had been roundly charged with treachery by their discomfited general, at length made his peace by an insincere submission. The greater part of his associates had preceded him in this course, and the others hastened to follow his example. Thus terminated abruptly, and in a great degree through the mutual

jealousies of the leaders, the last of three rebellions which had foiled the ablest generals, and consumed myriads of the bravest troops of England.' Phelan, 198, 200.

² He 'was deeply interested in the benefices and other estates belonging to the cathedral by long leases, which he had granted either to himself or to his children and kinsmen.' Mant, 311.

³ *Ibid.* 312.

undoubtedly be an evil whenever it had an archbishop who considered his patronage as a public trust. At a subsequent period, interference with St. Patrick's having been abandoned, archbishop Loftus promoted the foundation of an university in Dublin. Trinity college was the name given to this noble institution, and the first stone of its buildings was laid in March, 1592. In the following January the first students were admitted into it, and among them was the admirable James Ussher, nephew to Henry Ussher, soon after archbishop of Armagh, and ultimately prelate of that see himself.

§ 16. This eminent scholar, when very young, turned his attention to the controversies with Rome, so common in his time, and by means of Stapleton's *Fortress of the Faith* especially, he gained a very considerable acquaintance with them. Fitz-Symonds, a learned Jesuit, was then imprisoned in the castle of Dublin, where he talked of himself as 'like a bear tied to a stake, waiting for some to bait him.' He obviously meant this language for a challenge to the Protestant party, and young Ussher, though only nineteen, was put forward to overthrow his confident assertions. The Jesuit was naturally rather indignant at the prospect of a disputation with one whose years appeared so unequal to it; but he soon saw abundant reason for believing himself matched with an antagonist most unlikely to be vanquished. He, therefore, silently withdrew from the contest, not venturing to call for a second regular encounter. Ussher had made sufficient preparations for one, but finding no occasion for them, they lay among his papers until he was urged by some individuals of weight, both in England and Ireland, to render his materials more complete, and offer them to the world.¹ Obedience to this importunity made him publish his *Answer to a Jesuit*, in which Romanism is wounded through tradition, the very armour in which it professes to be invulnerable. But neither by this, nor by a similar work, more strictly national, his *Religion of the Ancient Irish and British*, were Ussher's countrymen generally prepared to profit. When the light of his erudition first shone upon them, their minds were closed against it by that sullen spirit of dissatisfaction towards every appeal from Protestantism and Britain, which so fearfully burst forth in the massacre of 1641. Nor has a great majority of them, down to this present time, been placed, by the current of civil affairs, in a condition to consider calmly how far the religious principles of their fellow-subjects are agreeable to the monuments of Christian antiquity, and favourable to national greatness. On the contrary, a succession of unfortunate circumstances has concurred to prolong,

¹ This appears from Ussher's own preface, but, perhaps, his mention of one meeting only is to be taken with some limitation. 'Twice or thrice (says Dr. Bernard) they had solemn disputations, though the Jesuit acknowledgeth but one. He was ready to have proceeded, but the Jesuit was weary of it.' (Mant, 333.) The writer must here

gratefully acknowledge his obligations to this work, which has excellently filled up an inconvenient void in the ecclesiastical history of these islands. The late learned and amiable bishop of Down and Connor established, by writing it, a new claim to the distinction which attended him through life.

and even exasperate, those uninquiring prejudices against the sister-island and her scriptural faith, which arose amid the struggles of semi-barbarous chieftains to retain a pernicious power, and which never have been free from external influences equally suspicious.

CHAPTER VI.

HISTORY OF THE SECT OF ANABAPTISTS OR MENNONITES.

§ 1. Origin of the Anabaptists, obscure — § 2, 3. Their probable origin — § 4. Their first movements — § 5. Their progress — § 6. Punishments decreed them — § 7. Those of Münster — § 8. Menno Simonis — § 9. His doctrine — § 10. Origin of sects among the Anabaptists — § 11. The more gross and the more refined — § 12. Source of the Mennonite religion — § 13. It was late reduced to a system — § 14. What it is — § 15. The first principle of their common doctrines — § 16. Their doctrines themselves — § 17. Their practical doctrines — § 18. Singular doctrines of certain sects — § 19. Their learning and erudition — § 20. Many sects among them — § 21. Permanent seat of the Mennonites first in Holland — § 22. The English Anabaptists — § 23. General and particular, what their views — § 24. David George — § 25. Henry Nicolai. The Familists.

§ 1. THE origin of the sect, which, from its repetition of the baptism received in other communities, is called that of *Anabaptists*,¹ but,

¹ The modern *Mennonites* are offended with this term, and profess to be entirely free from the practice of repeating *baptism*, on which this name is founded. They admit that the old *Anabaptists* had the custom of rebaptizing such as joined them from other denominations of Christians; but they say the custom at this day is laid aside by much the greater part of their community. See Herman Schyn's *Historie Mennonitarum plenior Deductio*, cap. ii. p. 32. But, unless I am altogether deceived, these good men here lose sight of that simplicity and ingenuousness which they at times so highly recommend, and artfully conceal the true ground of this appellation. They pretend that their predecessors were called *Anabaptists*, for this reason, that they thought those who had been baptized in other communities after they became adults and attained to the full use of reason, were to be baptized again. But it is certain that the name was given to them not only for that reason, but more especially because they considered the persons, who were initiated into the Christian church by baptism, in their infancy, as not belonging to the church at all; and, therefore, when such persons would join the *Anabaptists*, they baptized them a second time. And in this sentiment

all the sects of *Anabaptists* continue, quite to the present time, however much they may differ in other opinions and customs. Among the ancient *Anabaptists*, those in particular who are called *Flemings* or *Flandrians*, most fully merit this appellation. For they rebaptize not only those who received baptism in other denominations, in their childhood or infancy, but likewise such as received it in adult years. Nay, each particular sect of *Anabaptists* rebaptizes those who come to them from the other sects of their denomination: for each sect considers its own baptism to be the only true and valid baptism. The more moderate *Anabaptists*, or the *Waterlandians*, as they are called, are a little wiser; because they do not rebaptize such as were baptized at adult years in other denominations, nor those who were baptized in other sects of *Anabaptists*. And yet they are justly denominated *Anabaptists*, because they rebaptize those who received baptism in their infancy. Still, however, the patrons of the sect most carefully keep this custom out of sight; because they are afraid lest the almost extinguished odium should revive, and the modern *Mennonites* be regarded as descended from the flagitious *Anabaptists*, if they should frankly state the facts as they

from the very celebrated man, to whom it owes a large share of its present prosperity, that of *Mennonites*, is involved in much obscurity.¹ For it suddenly started up, in various countries of Europe, under the influence of leaders of dissimilar characters and views; and at a time when the first contest with the papists so distracted the attention of all, that people scarcely noticed any others among those which came up. The modern *Mennonites* affirm, that their predecessors were the descendants of those *Waldenses* who were oppressed by the tyranny of the papists; and that they were a most pure offspring utterly averse from any inclination towards political turbulence, as well as from fanatical dreams.² On the contrary, their adversaries contend that they are descended from those turbulent and furious *Anabaptists*, who, in the sixteenth century, involved

are. Hear a very recent writer (Schyn, *loc. cit.* p. 32), where he endeavours to show that his brethren are unjustly stigmatized with the odious name of Anabaptists: 'Anabaptismus ille (says he) plane obsolevit, et a multis retro annis neminem cujuscunque sectæ Christianæ fidei juxta mandatum Christi baptizatum, dum ad nostras ecclesias transire cupit, rebaptizaverunt;' i.e. *That Anabaptism has become wholly obsolete; and for many years past no person of any sect whatever, that holds the Christian faith, if baptized according to the command of Christ, when he wishes to join our churches, is rebaptized.* On reading this, who would not readily suppose that the repetition of baptism no longer exists among the Mennonites of our times? But the fallacy is in some measure betrayed by the words which are printed in capital letters: *according to the command of Christ.* For the Anabaptists contend that it is without any command of Christ that infants are admitted to baptism. And the whole design is more clearly indicated by the words which follow: 'sed illum etiam ADULTORUM baptismum, ut sufficientem agnoscunt.' And still, as if he had fully established his point, Schyn thus concludes his argument: 'Quam verissimum est, illud odiosum nomen Anabaptistarum illis non convenire.' But it does certainly belong to them; because the very best of the Mennonites, equally with those from whom they are descended, think that the baptism of infants has no validity; and, therefore, they cause those who have already been baptized among other Christians, to be again baptized with their baptism.—There are many things which induce me to believe that reliance cannot always be placed on the *Confessions* and the expositions of the modern Mennonites. Being instructed by the miseries and sufferings of their fathers, they conceal entirely those principles of their sect from which their character and state would most clearly appear; and

the others, which they cannot conceal, they must studiously disguise, that they may not appear too bad.

¹ The writers who treat of the Anabaptists, and who confute them, are enumerated at large, by Casp. Sagittarius, *Introductio ad Historiam Eccles. i.* 826, &c. and by Chr. Matth. Pfaff, *Introduct. in Histor. Litterariam Theol.* part ii. p. 349, &c. To their lists must be added the very recent writer, and doctor among the Mennonites, Herman Schyn; who first published his *Historia Mennonitarum*, Amsterd. 1723, 8vo, and afterwards his *Historiæ Mennonitarum plenior Deductio*, Amsterd. 1729, 8vo. Both the works will aid in acquiring a knowledge of the affairs of this sect; but neither of them deserves the title of a History of the Mennonites. For the writer deems it more his business to defend and justify his sect, than to give a regular narrative of their origin, progress, and revolutions. Yet he does not perform the functions of a vindicator so learnedly and judiciously, that the Mennonites could not have a better patron. Of the historians and the confessions of the Mennonites, Jo. Christ. Köcher treats, in *Bibliotheca Theol. Symbolicæ*, p. 461, &c. [The principal English histories of baptism and of the Baptists or Mennonites, are Wm. Wall's *Hist. of Infant Baptism*, 2 vols. 8vo, Lond. 1705; his *Defence of the History*; and Gale's *Reflections on Wall's History*: Thomas Crosby's *Hist. of the Baptists*, 4 vols. 8vo, 1739. Robt. Robinson's *Hist. of Baptism*, Lond. 1790, 4to, abridged by D. Benedict, Boston, 1817, 8vo; and David Benedict's *General History of the Baptists*, Boston, 1813, 2 vols. 8vo. *Tr.*]

² Galenus Abrahamzon's *Verdediging der Christenen, die Doopsgezinde Genand Worden*, p. 29. Herman Schyn's *Plenior Deductio Histor. Mennonit.* cap. i. p. 2, &c.

Germany, Holland, Switzerland, and especially Westphalia, in so many calamities and civil wars; but that, being terrified by the dreadful fate of their associates, through the influence of *Menno Simonis* especially, they have gradually assumed a more sober character. After duly examining the whole subject with impartiality, I conceive that neither statement is altogether true.

§ 2. In the first place, I believe the *Mennonites* to be not altogether in the wrong, when they boast of a descent from those Waldensians, Petrobrusians, and others, who are usually styled *the Witnesses for the truth* before Luther. Prior to the age of *Luther*, there lay concealed in almost every country of Europe, but especially in Bohemia, Moravia, Switzerland, and Germany, very many persons, in whose minds was deeply rooted that principle, which the Waldensians, the Wickliffites, and the Hussites, maintained, some more covertly, and others more openly; namely, that the kingdom which Christ set up on the earth, or the visible church, is an assembly of *holy* persons, and ought therefore to be entirely free, not only from ungodly persons and sinners, but also from all institutions of human device against ungodliness. This principle lay at the foundation, and was the source of all that was new and singular in the religion of the *Mennonites*; and the greatest part of their singular opinions, as is well attested, were approved, some centuries before *Luther's* time, by those who had such views of the nature of the church of Christ.¹ Some of this class of people, perceiving that such a church

¹ As respects the Waldensians, see Philip a Limborch's *Historia Inquisitionis*, lib. i. cap. viii. p. 37. ['See also Lydie *Waldensia*, and Allix's *Ancient Churches of Piedmont*, ch. xxii—xxvi. p. 211—280. N.° *Macl.*] That the Wickliffites and Hussites were not far from the same sentiments, can be shown by adequate testimony. [That the Mennonites, as being one of those protestant sects, which renounced the Romish religion in the 16th century, resembled very much the Waldenses, the Wickliffites, and the Hussites, those earlier revolvers from the Romish worship, is undoubtedly true. And it may therefore be justly said, that 'the greatest part of their singular opinions,'—meaning those in which they differed from the Romish church,—'were approved, some centuries before Luther's time.' And this, I think, must be all that Dr. Mosheim intended to say. For, that in most of the points in which they appeared singular among Protestants, they bore a nearer resemblance to the proper Waldenses, the Wickliffites, and the Hussites, than the other Protestants, or than the Lutherans and the Reformed did, is very far from being true. On the contrary, it is a well-known historic fact, that in the 16th century, the genuine descendants of the old Waldensians, Wickliffites, and Hussites, who were numerous

in France, England, Bohemia, Moravia, &c. readily united with the Lutheran and the Reformed communities, and at length became absorbed in them; and that very few, if any, of them ever manifested a preference for the Mennonites, or for any of the Antipædobaptist sects of that age. The history of the Reformation, in all the countries where the ancient sects were found, fully establishes this fact; which is so adverse to the supposition of a legitimate descent of the Mennonites from the pure Waldensians. The first Mennonites were not persons who had before borne the name of Waldensians, or who were known descendants of Waldensians; nor did they originate either in, or near, the countries, where the Waldensians in that age resided. And if we endeavour to trace the history of that grand peculiarity of all Mennonites, their confining baptism to adult believers, and rejecting infant baptism altogether, we shall find, that at the time Menno first embraced it, it existed among the numerous German Anabaptists, but not among the Waldenses of France or Bohemia, who were then universally believers in infant baptism, and were in fraternal communion with the Lutheran and Reformed churches. These Waldensian Pædobaptists, moreover, declared that they held the same belief which their fathers had maintained for

as they had formed an idea of, would never be established by human means, indulged the hope that God himself would, in his own time, erect for himself a new church, free from every blemish and impurity; and that he would raise up certain persons, and fill them with heavenly light, for the accomplishment of this great object. Others, more discreet, looked for neither miracles nor inspiration; but judged that the church might be purified from all the contaminations of evil men, and be brought into the state that Christ had intended, by human efforts and care, provided the practice and the regulations of the ancient Christians were restored to their pristine dignity and influence.

§ 3. The spirits and courage of this people, who had long been severely persecuted and scattered over many countries, revived as soon as they heard that *Luther*, aided by many good men, was successfully engaged in reforming the very corrupt state of the church. According to their different principles and views, some supposed, that the time was now come, when God himself would take possession of men's hearts, and would set up his heavenly kingdom on the earth; others concluded, that the long expected and wished-for restitution of the church, to be effected indeed under the providence of God, but yet by human agency, was now at hand. With these, as is common in such great revolutions, were joined many everywhere of similar aims, but of unlike capacities: who in a short time, by their discourses, their dreams, their prophecies, roused up a large part of Europe, and drew over to the party a vast multitude of the ignorant and ill-informed people. The leaders of this large multitude, erroneously conceiving that the new kingdom which they foretold was to be free from all evils and imperfections, because they considered the Reformation of the church which *Luther* had commenced, not to correspond with the magnitude of the case, projected themselves a more perfect reformation of it, or, rather, projected another and altogether a divine church.

§ 4. Whether the origin of this discordant sect, which caused such mischief in both the civil and religious community, is to be sought for in Switzerland, or in Holland and Germany, or in some other country, it is not important to know, and is impossible fully to

several centuries; and they appealed to their old books to make good their assertions. See Jo. Paul Perrin's *History of the Waldenses*, pt. i. b. i. ch. iv. p. 15, of the English translation; and pt. iii. b. iii. iv. p. 99. Nor does ecclesiastical history appear to me to disprove the truth of their assertion. There were, indeed, various mystical sects, tinctured more or less with Manichæan views, in the twelfth and following centuries, who rejected all water-baptism, on much the same grounds as the Quakers still do (cent. xii. pt. ii. c. 5, § 4 above); and some of these assailed infant baptism especially, as being peculiarly un-

suitable and absurd. There is also pretty good evidence, that early in the twelfth century, Peter Bruis and his successor Henry, with their followers, the Petrobrusians and Henricians, did at first reject infant baptism, without discarding all baptism. (See cent. xii. pt. ii. c. 5, § 7, 8, and the notes there.) But soon after, Peter Waldo arose, and gave birth to the proper Waldensians; and we hear no more of the Petrobrusians and Henricians. They probably gave up their opposition to infant baptism. See Wall's *Hist. of Infant Baptism*, pt. ii. ch. vii. *Tr.*]

determine.¹ In my opinion, this only can be said, that at one and the same time, that is, not long after the commencement of the reformation by Luther, there arose men of this sort in several different countries. This may be inferred from the fact, that the first leaders of any note among the *Anabaptists*, were, nearly all, founders of distinct sects. For though all these reformers of the church, or rather projectors of new churches, are called *Anabaptists*, because they all denied that infants are proper subjects of baptism, and solemnly baptized over again those who had been baptized in infancy, yet, from the very beginning, just as at the present day, they were split into various parties, which disagreed and disputed about points of no small importance. The worst part of this motley tribe, namely, the one which supposed that the founders of their ideal and perfect church would be endued with divine powers, and would work miracles, began to raise great disturbances in Saxony and the neighbouring countries, in the year 1521, under the guidance of *Thomas Münzer*, *Mark Stübner*, *Nicholas Storch*, and other chiefs. They first pursued their object by means of harangues, argumentations, and accounts of divine visions, to which the leaders of the party made pretensions. But finding these means less efficient than they could wish, and that their influence was resisted by the arguments of *Luther* and others, they rushed to arms. *Münzer* and his associates, having collected a vast army from among the credulous populace, particularly in country villages, in Suabia, Thuringia, Franconia, and Saxony, proclaimed war, in the year 1525, against all law and civil governments, and declared, that *Christ* alone would reign from that time forward. But these forces were routed without much difficulty by the elector of Saxony and other princes; *Münzer*, the firebrand of sedition, was put to death, and his aiders and abettors were dispersed.²

§ 5. This bloody defeat rendered the others, whom the same turbulent and fanatical spirit actuated, more timid, but not more wise. It appears that, from this time onward, there roamed about Germany, Switzerland, and Holland, many persons infected with the same criminal principles which had proved the ruin of *Münzer*: that in many places they disturbed both the church and the state by their seditious discourses; gathered here and there larger or smaller congregations; in the name of God, announced sudden destruction as about to overtake the magistrates and the civil governments; and while they pretended to be ambassadors of God, often insulted audaciously the Divine majesty by their shameful conduct and crimes. Infamous with posterity, beyond others of this senseless tribe, were

¹ Whether the Anabaptists appeared first in Germany or in Switzerland, is made the subject of inquiry, by Jo. Conrad Fuesslin, *Beiträge zur Schweizerischen Reformations-Geschichte*, i. 190, ii. 64, 65, 265, 327, 328, iii. 323. But he is not self-consistent in this discussion, nor has

he accomplished anything.

² See Ludov. a Seckendorf's *Historia Lutheranismi*, l. i. p. 192, 304, &c., l. ii. p. 13. Jo. Sleidan, *Commentarii*, lib. v. p. 47. Joach. Camerarius, *Vita Melancthonis*, p. 44, &c.

the names of *Lewis Hetzer*, *Balthazar Hubmeyer*, *Felix Mantz*, *Conrad Grebel*, *Melchior Hofmann*, *George Jacobs*, who would, if their means had allowed, have involved all Switzerland, Holland, and Germany, in tumults and wars.¹ Among these people there were some strangely delirious, who fancied that they had incredible visions: but such of them as were not utterly without common sense taught in substance the following doctrines: I. That the church of Christ ought to be free from all sin. II. That a community of goods

¹ See the details collected, among others, by Jo. Baptist Ottius, in his *Annales Anabaptistici*, p. 21, &c. by Jo. Hornbeck, *Summa Controversiarum*, l. v. p. 332. *Anth. Matthæus, Analecta Vet. Aevi*, iv. 629, 677, 679; recent ed. Bernhard Raupach, *Austria Evangelica*, ii. 41. Jo. Geo. Schelhorn, *Acta ad Historiam Eccles. pertinentia*, i. 100. Godfrey Arnold, *Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*, book xvi. ch. xxi. p. 727, &c. Jo. Conr. Fuesslin, in the various documents relating to the Anabaptists, which he has inserted in his *Beyträge zu der Schweitzerischen Reformations-Geschichte* [and more recently, Professor Wills, *Beyträge zur Geschichte des Anabaptismus in Deutschland nebst wichtigen Urkunden und Beylagen*, Nuremb. 1773. 8vo.—LEWIS HETZER, whom some take to be a Bavarian, and others a Swiss, was a man of abilities; and well versed especially in the languages. Joachim Vadianus (see Fuesslin, v. 397) calls him: ‘Commodissimi ingenii hominem, clarum virum linguis etiam ad admirabili ingenii dexteritate præditum.’ He lived in the time of the Reformation at Zurich, and aided the reformers by his discourses and his writings; among other things he translated *Æcolampadius’* book of *Sacramento Eucharistie* into German, in 1526. But he afterwards separated from them, and followed his own views in theology, which were often singular; as appears from his writings, published between 1523 and 1529. Among other works, he translated the prophets, with the assistance of Hans Denk. He also wrote, in 1523, a book against the divinity of Christ; which Ambrose Blarer, by direction of Zwingli, confuted. He was among the extravagant Anabaptists; and was beheaded at Constance, in 1529, because he cohabited with many women, and perverted the Scriptures to justify his unchastity.—BALTHAZAR HUBMEYER, who sometimes called himself Friedberger, from his native place in Bavaria, is, in the above-cited epistle of Joach. Vadianus, pronounced ‘eloquentissimus et humanissimus vir.’ Before the Reformation, he was for a time preacher in the principal church at Regensburg; where he became suspected, on account of some erroneous doc-

trines, and was obliged to quit the place. Afterwards he preached at Waldshut. But as he allowed himself to be led astray by Thomas Münzer, he was driven from that place also; and fleeing to Zurich, he was thrown into prison; but after three days’ discussion with Zwingli, he recanted. Yet continuing afterwards enthusiastic, he was expelled the city, and retired to Moravia, where he fell into the hands of the Austrian government, and was burnt alive at Vienna, in 1528. His writings are enumerated by Fuesslin, *Beyträge*, v. 399, &c.—FELIX MANTZ, of Zurich, was there apprehended, with others, on account of his Anabaptistic doctrines, and was drowned. See Fuesslin, *Beyträge*, v. 259, &c.—GREBEL was also of Zurich, of a good family, and of great talents; but of so great obstinacy, that nothing could induce him to change his opinions. Yet he fortunately escaped from prison, and afterwards died a natural death.—MELCHIOR HOFMANN was a furrier of Suabia, who laboured to disseminate the doctrines of the Anabaptists in the Netherlands, and in Lower Saxony and Livonia; and died in prison, at Strasburg, in 1533. To enumerate his writings here would be tedious.—JACOBI is called, in the documents (see Fuesslin’s *Beyträge*, v. 265), Georg von Hause Jacobs, genant Blaurock von Chur. He was twice apprehended at Zurich, was beaten with rods, and, after twice swearing to keep the peace, was banished the country.—To the preceding may be added JOHN DENK, who once taught in the school of St. Sebald, at Nuremberg, but, after his connexion with the Anabaptists, resided chiefly at Bâle and at Worms. He taught also the *restoration of all things*; and aided Hetzer, as already stated, in his translation of the prophets; which was published at Worms, 1527, folio. His smaller pieces were printed a second time, Amsterd. 1680, 12mo. Several extracts are given by Arnold, *Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*, part iv. sec. ii. No. 31, p. 530, &c. See also Dr. Büttenhausen’s *Beyträge zur Pfälzischen Geschichte*, part iii. p. 299, whence we learn, that Denk recanted, before he died; and that his recantation was published, probably, by *Æcolampadius*. *Schl.*]

and universal equality should be introduced. III. That all usury, tithes, and tributes, were to be abolished. IV. That the baptism of infants was an invention of the devil. V. That all Christians had a right to act as teachers. VI. That the Christian church, of course, had no need of ministers or teachers. VII. Neither was there any need of magistrates under the reign of Christ. VIII. That God still made known his will, to certain persons, by dreams and visions.¹ I omit other opinions. It would, however, betray ignorance or want of candour, to deny that there were everywhere others, given up in general to the same opinions, who lived more quietly and peaceably; and in whom no great fault can be found, except their erroneous notions, and their zeal to disseminate them among the people. Nor do I fear to add, that among the followers, not only of these more sober Anabaptists, but even of those altogether misguided, there were many persons of honest intentions, and of real piety, whom an unsuspecting simplicity, and a laudable desire to reform the church, had led to join the party.

§ 6. While this tumultuous sect was spreading itself through nearly all Europe, the emperors, kings, princes, and magistrates resisted them with very severe edicts, and at last with capital punishments.² But here also the maxim was fully verified, which long experience has proved true, that the human mind, when either agitated by fanatical fury, or strongly bound by the cords of religion, is not easily cured by terrors and dangers. Vast numbers of these people in nearly all the countries of Europe, would rather perish miserably, by drowning, hanging, burning, or decapitation, than renounce the opinions which they had embraced. And therefore the Mennonites, at this day, show us ponderous volumes, filled with the accounts of the lives and sufferings of those of their party, who expiated by death the crimes which they were supposed to have committed against either the church or the state.³ I could wish there had been some distinction made; and that all who believed that adults only are to be baptized, and that the ungodly are to be expelled the church, had not been indiscriminately put to death. For they did not all suffer on account of their *crimes*, but many of them, merely for their erroneous *opinions*, which they maintained with honesty and good faith. Yet most of them told the people of their dreams about a new church of Christ soon to be set up, which would abolish all magistracies, laws, and punishments: hence the

¹ These are chiefly collected from the documents published by Fuesslin. [Whether they also denied the divinity of Christ, and justified polygamy, Fuesslin examines, in his *Beyträge*, iii. 119; and evinces, by documents, that they did not. *Schl.*]

² If I do not mistake, it was first in Saxony, and in 1525, that laws were enacted against this sort of people. And these laws were frequently renewed, in 1527, 1528, and 1534. See Jo. Erh. Kapp's *Nachlese von Reformations-Urkun-*

den, pt. i. p. 176. As the impudence of many of this sect became more bold, Charles V. published severe decrees against them in 1527 and 1529. Ottius, *Annales Anabaptist.* p. 45. The Swiss proceeded very gently, at first, against their Anabaptists; but when many of them became more bold, in consequence of this lenity, the canton of Zurich, in 1525, made them liable to capital punishment.

³ See Joach. Christ. Jehring's Preface to his *Historie der Mennoniten*, p. 3, &c.

very name of *Anabaptist* presented at once before the mind the idea of a seditious person, that is, one who was a public pest. It is indeed true, that many *Anabaptists* were put to death, not as being bad citizens, or injurious members of civil society, but as being *incurable heretics*, and condemned by the old canon laws: for the error concerning adult baptism, or *Catabaptism* and *Anabaptism*, was in that age looked upon as a horrible offence. But it is also true, that very many were put to death for holding opinions dangerous to the commonwealth and to the civil authorities; and numbers also suffered for their temerity, their imprudences, and their criminal deeds.

§ 7. The saddest example of this is afforded in the case of those Anabaptists from Holland, who came to Münster, a city of Westphalia, in the year 1533, and there committed deeds, which would be scarcely credible, were they not so well attested as to compel belief. These infatuated men, whose brains were turned by that dream of a new kingdom of Christ about to be erected on the earth, which bewildered the great body of Anabaptists, under the guidance of certain illiterate and plebeian men, *John Matthæi*, *John Bockhold*, a tailor of Leyden, one *Gerhard*, and some others, persuaded not only the common people, but likewise some of the religious teachers, that their blessed heavenly Jerusalem was about to be established at Münster, and would thence be extended to other places. Under this pretext, they deposed the magistrates, took command of the city, and ventured upon all the criminal and ridiculous measures, which their perverse ingenuity could devise.¹ *John Bockhold* was created king and lawgiver to this celestial republic. But the issue of the scene was tragical and distressing. For after a long siege, the city was captured, in 1536, by its bishop, who was also its temporal lord, *Francis, count of Waldeck*; this New Jerusalem of the Anabaptists was destroyed, and its king punished with the utmost severity.² As it was but too manifest, from this and from other events of a similar nature,³ whither the principles of this school

¹ ['Bockholdt, or Bockelson, alias John of Leyden, who headed them at Münster, ran stark naked in the streets, married eleven wives, at the same time, to show his approbation of polygamy, and entitled himself *King of Sion*; all which was but a very small part of the pernicious follies of this mock-monarch.' *Mach.*]

² Anton. Corvinus, *Narratio de miserabili Monaster. Anabapt. Eicidio*; first published, Wittemb. 1536, and then elsewhere: and the other writers mentioned by Caspar Sagittarius, *Introd. in Historiam Eccles.* i. 537 and 835. Add Herm. Hamelmann's *Historia renati Evangelii in urbe Monasterii*: in his *Opera Genealogico-Historica*, p. 1203, &c. The elegant and accurately written Latin elegiac poem of Jo. Fabricius Boland, entitled *Motus Monasteriensis libri decem*, Cologne, 1546, 8vo. Herm. Kerssenbrock's *Historia Belli Monasteriensis*;

published by Dan. Gerdes, *Miscellan. Gröningens. Nova*, ii. 375. Gerdes also treats (*ibid.* ii. 403) of Bernhard Rhotmann, a minister of the Gospel at Münster, a man in other respects neither of a bad character nor unlearned, who joined with these Anabaptists, and aided them in their mad projects.

³ ['The scenes of violence, tumult, and sedition, that were exhibited in Holland by this odious tribe, were also terrible. They formed the design of reducing the city of Leyden to ashes, but were happily prevented and severely punished. John of Leyden, the Anabaptist king of Münster, had taken it into his head that God had made him a present of the cities of Amsterdam, Deventer, and Wesel; in consequence thereof, he sent bishops to these three places, to preach his gospel of sedition and carnage. About the beginning of

might lead unstable and incautious men, it is not strange that the magistrates were eager to extirpate the roots of such mischief with fire and sword.¹

§ 8. To this miserable sect, when stricken with the greatest terrors, while its members grieved over the extinction of all their hopes from the men of Münster, and were anxiously inquiring what they could do for safety, as both the good and the bad among them were daily hurried away to inevitable destruction, great consolation and support were afforded, by *Menno Simonis*, of Friesland, once a popish priest, and, as he himself confesses, a debauched character. He first covertly and secretly united with the Anabaptists; but afterwards, in the year 1536, quitting the sacred office which he had hitherto held among the papists, he openly espoused their cause. And now in the year 1537, he listened to the entreaties of several of these people, whom he describes as sober, pious persons, that had taken no part in the criminal transactions at Münster; though others think them to have been associates of the Westphalian rabble, that had become wiser by the calamities of their brethren; and consented to assume the functions of their religious teacher. From this period to the end of his days, or for about five-and-twenty years, he travelled, with his wife and children, amidst perpetual sufferings and daily perils of his life, over very many regions of country; first in West Friesland, the territory of Gröningen, and East Friesland, then in Gelderland, Holland, Brabant, Westphalia, and the German provinces along the shores of the Baltic as far as Livonia; and gathered an immense number of followers, so that he was almost the common father and bishop of all the Anabaptists, and may justly be considered the founder of the flourishing sect that has continued down to our times. The reasons why he had so great success may readily be conceived, if we consider the manners and spirit of the man, and the

the year 1535, twelve Anabaptists, of whom five were women, assembled at midnight in a private house of Amsterdam. One of them, who was a tailor by profession, fell into a trance, and after having preached and prayed for the space of four hours, stripped himself naked, threw his clothes into the fire, and commanded all the assembly to do the same, in which he was obeyed without the least reluctance. He then ordered them to follow him through the streets *in this state of nature*, which they accordingly did, howling and bawling out, *Woe! woe! the wrath of God! the wrath of God! woe to Babylon!* When, after being seized and brought before the magistrates, clothes were offered them to cover their indecency, they refused them obstinately, and cried aloud, *We are the naked truth.* When they were brought to the scaffold, they sang and danced, and discovered all the marks of enthusiastic frenzy.—These tumults were followed by a regular and deep-laid conspiracy, formed

by Van Geelen (an envoy of the mock-king of Münster, who had made a very considerable number of proselytes) against the magistrates of Amsterdam, with a design to wrest the government of that city out of their hands. This incendiary marched his fanatical troop to the town-house on the day appointed, drums beating, and colours flying, and fixed there his head-quarters. He was attacked by the burghers, assisted by some regular troops, and headed by several of the burgomasters of the city. After an obstinate resistance he was surrounded, with his whole troop, who were put to death in the severest and most dreadful manner, to serve as examples to the other branches of the sect, who were exciting commotions of a like nature in Friesland, Gröningen, and other provinces and cities in the Netherlands.' *Macl.*]

¹ Gerh. Brandt's *History of the Reformation in Belg.* t. i. l. ii. p. 119, &c.

condition of the party, when he joined it. *Menno* possessed genius, though not much cultivated, as his writings prove, and a natural eloquence. Of learning, he had just enough to be esteemed very learned and almost an oracle, by the raw and undiscerning multitude. Moreover, if we may give credit to his statements and declarations, he was a man of integrity, mild, accommodating, laborious, patient of injuries, and so ardent in his piety, as to exemplify in his own life the precepts which he gave to others. A man of such a character would readily obtain followers, among any sort of people; but among none more than among such as the Anabaptists then were, a people simple, ignorant of all learning, accustomed to teachers that raved and howled rather than instructed them, very often deluded by impostors, worn out with perpetual suffering, and now in constant peril of their lives.¹

¹ Menno was born not, as many say, in 1496, but in 1505, and at Witmarsum, a village near Bolswert, in Friesland. After being variously tossed about during his whole life, he died in 1561, in the duchy of Holstein, on an estate situated not far from Oldeslo, and belonging to a nobleman, who was touched with compassion for the man, exposed now to continual plots, and who received both him and his associates under his protection, and afforded him an asylum. An account of Menno has been carefully drawn up by Jo. Möller, in his *Cimbria Litterata*, ii. 835, &c. See also Herm. Schyn's *Plenior Deductio Historiæ Mennonit.* c. vi. p. 116. His writings, which are nearly all in the Dutch language, were published the most completely, Amsterd. 1651, folio. One who is disgusted with a style immoderately diffuse and rambling, with frequent and needless repetitions, with great confusion in the thoughts and matter, with pious but extremely languid exhortations, will rise from the perusal of them with but little satisfaction. [A concise history of his life, or rather a development of his religious views, drawn up by himself, is found both prefixed to the complete edition of his works (Amsterd. 1651, folio), and in the 2nd vol. of Herman Schyn's *History of the Mennonites (Historiæ Mennonitar. Plenior Deductio*, p. 118, &c. Amsterd. 1729, 8vo).—It contains, I. A short and lucid account how, and why, he forsook popery. II. A short and plain confession of faith of the Mennonites. III. Concise instructions, in questions and answers, derived from Scripture, for such as would join their community. Menno was born in 1505 at Witmarsum, in Friesland. In his 24th year, he became a priest of the Romish church in the village of Penningen. His rector had some learning; and he, and another clergyman under him, had some acquaintance with the Scriptures; but Menno had never

read them, being afraid they would mislead him. But the thought soon occurred to him, as he read mass, whether the bread and the wine could be the real body and blood of Christ. At first, he supposed this thought was a suggestion of the devil: and he often confessed it, and sighed, and prayed; but could not get rid of it. With his fellow-clergymen he daily spent his time in playing, drinking, and other indulgences. At length he took up reading the New Testament, and he soon learned from it that he had hitherto been deceived in regard to the mass: and Luther helped to the idea, that disregarding human prescriptions did not draw after it eternal death. His examination of the Scriptures carried him further and further, and he began to be called an evangelical preacher, and everybody loved him. But when he heard that an honest man was put to death at Lewarden, because he had been rebaptized, he was at first surprised to hear of a repetition of baptism; he went to consulting the Scriptures, and he there could find nothing said about infant baptism. He held a discussion on the subject with his rector, who was obliged to concede the same fact. Some ancient writers taught him that children, by such baptism, were cleansed from original sin; but this seemed to him, according to the Scriptures, to militate against the efficacy of *Christ's* blood. After this (we give all along his own account), he turned to Luther: but his assertion, that children must be baptized on account of their own faith, appeared contrary to the Scriptures. Equally unsatisfactory to him was the opinion of Bucer—that the baptism of infants is necessary, in order that they be more carefully watched, and be trained up in the ways of the Lord: and also Bullinger's referring it to a covenant, and appealing to circumcision. Not long after this, he was made rector of his native vil-

§ 9. *Menno* had struck out a system of doctrine, which was much milder and more tolerable than that of the furious and fanatical portion of the Anabaptists; yet perhaps somewhat harsher, though better digested, than that of the wiser and more moderate of them, who merely wished (but had indefinite conceptions about it) to see the church restored to its long-lost purity. He therefore condemned the expectation of a new kingdom of Jesus Christ, to be set up in the world, by violence and the expulsion of magistrates; which had been the prolific cause of so many seditions and crimes: he condemned the marvellous restitution of the church, by a new and extraordinary effusion of the Holy Spirit: he condemned the licentiousness of polygamy and divorce: and he would not endure those who believed that the Holy Spirit descended into the minds of many, as at the first establishment of Christianity, and manifested his presence by miracles, prophecies, divine dreams, and visions. What the Anabaptists had commonly taught, respecting infant baptism, respecting a coming thousand years' reign of Christ, before the end of the world, respecting the inadmissibility of magistrates in the Christian church, respecting the prohibition of wars, and of oaths, by Christ, respecting the inutility and the mischief of human learning, he retained, indeed; but he so corrected and improved these doctrines, that they appeared to come nearer to accordance with the common tenets of Protestants. Thus he formed a system of religion, which, being highly recommended, by the nature of the precepts themselves, by the eloquence of the preacher, and by the circumstances of the times, gained a hold upon the minds of most of the Anabaptists with astonishing facility.

lage, Witmarsum, where he preached, indeed, much from the Scriptures, but without being himself made better. In the mean time he glories in having attained to correct views of baptism and the Lord's Supper, by the illumination of the Holy Ghost, and by frequent perusal of the Scriptures. With the disturbances at Münster he was greatly troubled; he ascribed them to erring zeal, and opposed them in his sermons and exhortations. Yet he was so much affected by the example of multitudes who sacrificed themselves for the interest of the party, that he felt more and more distress and shame on account of his own state of mind; he prayed God to aid him; his whole state of mind became changed; and he now taught Christian piety much more purely and effectually. And the discovery which he had made of the corrupt state of the Romish church induced him, in 1536, utterly to renounce it, as well as his priestly office, which he calls his *departure from Babylon*. The next year, there came to him several godly Anabaptists, who most importunately entreated him, in their own name, and in that of other devout men of the same faith, to become the teacher of this dispersed and persecuted company. He at length consented; and he remarks, on this

occasion, that he was called to the office of teacher, neither by the insurgents of Münster nor by any other turbulent party, but by true professors of Christ and his word, who sought the salvation of all around them, and took up their cross. Thenceforth, during eighteen years, amidst many perils and discouragements, poverty and want, and often concealed in lurking-places with his wife and children, he discharged the duties of his office; and thereby (says he) hath God, in many cities and countries, brought his church to such a glorious state, that not only have a multitude of vicious persons been reclaimed, but also the most renowned doctors and the most cruel tyrants have been made to stand confounded and ashamed before those who have suffered with him.—To this, which is Menno's own account, other writers add that, with unwearied activity, in Friesland, Gelderland, Holland, and Brabant, in Westphalia, and generally in Northern Germany, as far as Livonia, he either planted and strengthened Anabaptist churches, or reduced them to order and to unanimity; until, at last, in 1561, he died at Oldeslo in the duchy of Holstein.—Translated from Schroeckh's *Kirchengeschichte seit der Reformation*, v. 444—447. Tr.]

The result was, that, by the influence of *Menno*, the *Anabaptists* of both sorts, excluding fanatical persons, and rejecting opinions pernicious to the state, became consolidated, as it were, into one family or community.¹

¹ These facts show how the famous question concerning the origin of the Mennonites may be readily solved. The Mennonites use every argument they can devise to prevent credence being given to what is taught in innumerable books, that the modern are the descendants of the ancient Anabaptists. See Herm. Schyn's *Historia Mennonitar.* cap. viii. ix. xxi. p. 223, &c. Nor is the reason of their zeal in this matter difficult to ascertain. This timid people, living dispersed among their enemies, are afraid lest the malevolent should take occasion from that relationship to renew those laws against their existence and their safety, by which those ancient disturbers of the public peace were put down. At least, they hope the severe odium which has long ranked against them will be much diminished, provided they can fully eradicate from the public mind the belief, that the Mennonites are the successors of the Anabaptists, or rather are themselves Anabaptists, though reformed and made wiser than their predecessors. But I must candidly own that, after carefully comparing what the Mennonites and their antagonists have advanced on this subject, I am unable to determine what the precise point in dispute between them is. In the first place, if the Mennonites wish to maintain that Menno, the founder of the present existing sect, was not infected with those opinions, by which the men of Münster, and others like them, drew upon themselves deserved punishments; and consequently, that he did not propose to establish a new church of Christ, entirely free from all evil, nor command the abolition of all civil laws and magistrates, or impose upon himself and others by fanatical dreams; then they will find us all ready to agree with them. All this is readily conceded by those, who at the same time contend, that there most certainly was an intimate connexion between the ancient and the modern Anabaptists. Again, if the Mennonites would maintain that the churches which have adopted the discipline of Menno, quite to the present time, not only have been studious of peace and tranquillity, have plotted no insurrections or revolutions among the people who were their fellow-citizens, have always been averse from slaughter and blood, and have shunned all familiarity with persons professing to have visions and to hold converse with God; but likewise have excluded from their public discourses, and from their confessions of faith, [principles and tenets, which were] causes that led the

ancient Anabaptists to pursue a different course of conduct; here also, we present them the hand of friendship and agreement. And finally, if they contend that not all who bore the names of Anabaptists, prior to the times of Menno, were delirious and as furious as Münster, or the faction at Münster, and others; that many persons of this name abstained from all criminal and flagitious deeds, and only trod in the steps of the ancient Waldenses, Henricians, Petrobrusians, Hussites, and Wickliffites; and that these upright and peaceable persons subjected themselves to the precepts and opinions of Menno, we shall still make no objections.

But, I. If they would have us believe that none of the Mennonites are, by birth and blood, descendants of those people who once overwhelmed Germany and other countries with so many calamities; or that none of the furious and fanatical Anabaptists became members of the community which derives its name from Menno; then they may be confuted, both by the testimony of Menno himself, who proclaims that he had convinced some of this pestiferous faction, and also by many other proofs. The first Mennonite churches were certainly composed of Anabaptists of both the better sort and the worse. Nor, if the Mennonites should admit this (which is true beyond contradiction), would they expose themselves to more infamy than we do, when we admit that our ancestors were blind idolaters.

And, II. We must be equally at variance with them, if they deny that the Mennonites hold any portion at all of those opinions which once betrayed the turbulent and seditious Anabaptists into so many and so enormous crimes. For, not to mention what has long since been remarked by others, that Menno himself styled those Anabaptists of Münster, whom his children at this day execrate as pests, his *brethren*, though with the qualification of *erring*;—I say, not to mention this, it is the fact that the very doctrine, concerning the nature of Christ's kingdom, or the church of the New Testament, which led the ancient Anabaptists, step by step, to become furious and open rebels, is not yet wholly eradicated from the minds of the modern Mennonites; although it has gradually become weakened, and, in the more moderate, has ceased to vegetate, or, at least, has lost its power to do harm. I will not here inquire whether even the more peaceful community of Menno

§ 10. *Menno* must have possessed more than human power if he had been able to diffuse peace and good order through a body so discordant, made up of members, too, actuated by different spirits, and had bound it altogether in one harmonious whole. About the middle of the century, a violent dispute arose among the Anabaptists [or Mennonites] respecting excommunication, occasioned chiefly by *Leonard Bouwenson* and *Theodore Philippi*, and its effects have continued down to the present time. The men just named maintained, not only that all transgressors, even those that seriously lamented and deplored their fall, ought to be at once cast out of the church without previous admonition: but also, that the excommunicated were to be debarred from all social intercourse with their wives, husbands, brothers, sisters, children, and other relatives. They likewise required obedience to a very austere and difficult system of morals. But to many of the Anabaptists this appeared to be going too far. And hence, suddenly, the Anabaptists became split into two sects; the one more lenient towards transgressors, the other more severe; the one requiring a sordid style of living and very austere morals, the other yielding a little to the weakness of nature and to the elegances of life. *Menno* laboured indeed to restore harmony to his community, but, discovering no possible way to effect it, he fluctuated as it were, during his whole life, between those two sects. For at one time he seemed to favour the severer party, and at another the more lax brethren. And this inconstancy of one in so high authority, tended not a little to increase disquietude and commotion.¹

§ 11. These two large sects of Anabaptists [or Mennonites] are distinguished by the appellations of the *Fine* and the *Gross* (*die Feinen und die Groben, Subtiles et Crassi*), i.e. the *more Rigid*, and the *more Lux*. Those called the *Fine* hold and observe, more strictly than the others, both the ancient doctrines, and the morals and discipline of the Anabaptists: the *Gross* depart further from the original opinions, morals, and discipline of the sect, and approach nearer to those of the Protestants. The greater part of the *Gross* or lax Mennonites, at first, were inhabitants of a region in the North of Holland, called *Waterland*; and hence this whole sect received the name of *Waterlanders*.² A majority of the severer sect were in-

has not, at any time, been agitated with violent commotions; nor am I disposed to pry into what may be now taking place among its minor sects and parties; for that the larger sects, especially those of North Holland, shun the men who are actuated by a fanatical spirit, is made sufficiently clear by the fact that they most carefully exclude all Quakers from their communion.

¹ See the history of the contests and controversies among the Mennonites previous to the year 1615, composed by some Mennonite writer, and translated from Dutch into German by Joach. Christ. Jehring, and published, Jena, 1720, 4to; also Sim. Fred.

Rues, *Nachrichten von dem Zustande der Mennoniten*, Jena, 1743, 8vo.

² See Fred. Spanheim, *Elenchus Controvers. Theol.* Opp. iii. 772. This sect are also called *Johannites*, from *John de Ries* [Hans de Rys], who in various ways was serviceable to them, and in particular, with the aid of Lubbert Gerardi, in 1580, composed a confession of faith. This confession, which exceeds all others of the Mennonites in simplicity and soundness, has been often published, and recently by Herm. Schyn, in his *Historia Mennonitarum*, cap. vii, p. 172. It was explained in a copious commentary, in 1686, by Peter Joannis, a

habitants of *Flanders*; and hence their whole sect received the name of *Flemings* or *Flandrians*. Among these *Flandrians*, soon after, there arose new broils and contentions; not indeed respecting doctrines, but respecting the transgressors who ought to be excommunicated, and other minor matters. And hence, again, arose the two sects of *Flandrians* and *Frieslanders*, disagreeing in morals and discipline, and receiving their appellations from the majority of their respective partisans. To these were added a third sect of *Germans*; for many had removed from Germany, and settled in Holland and Belgium. But the greatest part of the *Flandrians*, the *Frieslanders*, and the *Germans*, gradually came over to the moderate sect of *Waterlanders*, and made peace with them. Such of the more rigid as would not follow this example, are at this day denominated the *old Flemings* or *Flandrians*; but they are far inferior in numbers to the more moderate [or the *Waterlanders*].

§ 12. As soon as senseless fanaticism subsided among the Mennonites, all their sects, however diverse in many respects, agreed in this, that the principles of religion are to be derived solely from the Holy Scriptures. And to make this the more manifest, they caused *Confessions* of faith, or papers containing a summary of their views of God, and the right mode of worshipping him, to be drawn up, almost in the very words of the divine books. The first of these *Confessions*, both in the order of time, and in rank, is that which the *Waterlanders* exhibit. This was followed by others; some of them common ones, presented to the magistrates; and others peculiar to certain parties.¹ But there is ground for inquiry, whether these formulas contain *all* that the Mennonites believe true; or whether they omit some things, very necessary for understanding the internal state of the sect. It will be seen, indeed, by every reader who bestows on them but a moderate degree of attention, that the doctrines which seem prejudicial to the public interests, particularly

Netherlander, and a minister among the *Waterlanders*. Yet this celebrated confession is said to be only the private confession of that church, over which its author presided, and not the general one of the *Waterlander* church. See Rues, *Nachrichten*, p. 93, 94. [For Rues asserts that he had seen a document, according to which an old minister of the church at Gouda affirmed, before notaries and witnesses, that the *Waterland* churches had never bound themselves by any particular confession of their faith; but that Rys drew up this confession for some English Baptists, who retired to Holland, but would not unite themselves with the *Waterlanders* until they had ascertained what their doctrinal views were. Rys, however, solemnly declared that this confession should not afterwards be binding on any one, but should be regarded as a mere private writing, which had reference only to the time then present. *Schl.*]

¹ Herm. Schyn treats expressly of these *Confessions* in his *Plenior Deductio Historiæ Mennonitar.* cap. iv. p. 78. And he concludes by saying (p. 115), *It hence appears that the Mennonites, from the times of Menno, have been as well agreed, in regard to the principal and fundamental articles of faith, as any other sect of Christians.* But if, perchance, the good man shall bring us to believe so, he would still find it very difficult to persuade many of his brethren of it; who have not yet ceased to contend warmly, and who think that the points, which he regards as unimportant to religion and piety, are of vast moment. And, indeed, how could any of the Mennonites, before this century, believe what he asserts, while the parties among them contended about matters, which he treats with contempt, as if their eternal salvation hung suspended on them?

those respecting magistrates and oaths, are most cautiously guarded and embellished, lest they should appear alarming. Moreover, the discerning reader will easily perceive that these points are not placed in their proper attitude, but appear artificially expressed. All this will be made clear from what follows.

§ 13. The old *Anabaptists*, because they believed themselves to have the Holy Spirit Himself for their teacher, did not so much as think of drawing up a system of religious doctrines, and of imbuing the minds of their people with a sound knowledge of religion. And hence they disagreed exceedingly, on points of the greatest importance; for instance, respecting the divinity of the Saviour, which some professed and others denied, and respecting polygamy and divorces. A little more attention was given to the subject by *Menno* and his disciples. Yet there was, even subsequently to this age, great licence of opinion on religious subjects among the Mennonites, and especially among those called the *Fine*, or the more *rigid*. And this single fact would be sufficient proof, if other arguments were not at hand, that the leaders of the sect esteemed it the smallest part of their duty to guard their people against embracing corrupt error; and that they considered the very soul of religion to consist in holiness of life and conduct. At length necessity induced first the Waterlanders, and afterwards the others, to set forth publicly a summary of their faith, digested under certain heads: for that rashness of dissenting and disputing on sacred subjects, which had long been tolerated, had drawn upon the community very great odium, and seemed to threaten to bring upon it banishment, if not something worse. Yet the *Mennonite Confessions* appear to be rather shields, provided for blunting the points of their enemies' arguments, than established rules of faith, from which no one may deviate. For, if we except a portion of the modern Waterlanders, it was never decreed among them, as it is among other sects of Christians, that no one must venture to believe or to teach, otherwise than is laid down in the public formulas. It was an established principle with them all, from the beginning (as the general character and spirit of the sect evinces), that religion consists in piety; and that the holiness of its members is the surest index of a true church.

§ 14. If we are to form our judgment of the Mennonite religion from their *Confessions* of faith, which are in everybody's hands, it differs but little, in most things, from that of the Reformed, but departs more widely from that of the Lutherans. For they attribute to what are called the sacraments, no other virtue than that of serving for signs; and they have a system of discipline not much different from that of the *Presbyterians*. The doctrines by which they are separated from all other Christian sects, as by a wall, are reducible to three heads. Some of them are common to all sects of Mennonites: others are received only in certain of the larger associations (and these are the doctrines for which *Menno* himself was not acceptable to all); and lastly, others exist only in the minor and more obscure associations. These last rise and sink, by turns, with the

sects that embrace them : and therefore deserve not a more particular notice.

§ 15. All the opinions which are common to the whole body are founded on this one principle, as their basis ; namely, that the kingdom which Christ has established on the earth, or the church, is a visible society or company, in which is no place for any but holy and pious persons ; and which therefore has none of those institutions and provisions that human sagacity has devised for the benefit of the ungodly. This principle was frankly avowed by the earlier Mennonites : but the moderns, in their confessions, either cover it up under words of dubious import, or appear to reject it : yet they cannot actually reject it ; at least, if they would be self-consistent, and would not deprive their doctrines of their native basis.¹ But in regard to the most recent Mennonites, as they have departed in very many things from the views and the institutions of their fathers, so they have abandoned nearly altogether this principle respecting the nature of the Christian church. And in this manner, sad experience, rather than either reason or the Holy Scriptures, has taught them wisdom. They therefore admit, first, that there is an *invisible* church of Christ, or one not open to human view, which extends through all Christian sects. And in the next place, they do not place the mark of a true church, as they once did, in the holiness of all its members ; for they admit, that the visible church of Christ consists of both good and bad men. On the contrary, they declare, that the marks of a true church are, a knowledge of the truth as taught by Jesus Christ, and the agreement of all the members, in professing and maintaining that truth.

§ 16. In the mean time, from that doctrine of the old Anabaptists respecting the church, flow the principal opinions by which they are distinguished from other Christians. This doctrine requires, I. that they should receive none into their church, by the sacrament of baptism, unless they are adults, and have the full use of their reason. Because it is uncertain, with regard to infants, whether they will become pious or irreligious ; neither can they pledge their faith to the church, to lead a holy life.—It requires, II. that they should not admit magistrates ; nor suffer any of their members to perform the functions of a magistrate. Because, where there are no bad men, there also magistrates are not necessary.—It requires, III. that they

¹ This appears from their *Confessions* ; and even from those, in which there is the greatest caution, to prevent the idea from entering the reader's mind. For instance, they first speak in lofty terms of the dignity, the excellence, the utility, and the divine origin of civil magistracy : and I am entirely willing, they should be supposed to speak here according to their real sentiments. But afterwards, when they come to the reasons, why they would have no magistrates in their community, they incautiously express what is in their hearts. In the 37th

article of the Waterland Confession, they say : ' This political power, the Lord Jesus hath not established, in his spiritual kingdom, the church of the New Testament ; nor hath he added it to the offices in his church.' The Mennonites believe, therefore, that the New Testament church is a republic, which is free from all evils, and from restraints upon the wicked. But why, I ask, did they not frankly avow this fact, while explaining their views of the church ; and not affect ambiguity and concealment ?

should deny the justice of repelling force by force, and of waging war. Because, as those who are perfectly holy cannot be provoked by injuries nor commit them, so they have no need of the support of arms, in order to their safety.—It requires, IV. that they should have strong aversion to all penalties and punishments, and especially to capital punishments. Because punishments are aimed against the wickedness and the crimes of men; but the church of Christ is free from all crimes and wickedness.—It forbids, V. the calling God to witness any transactions, or confirming anything by an oath. Because minds that are actuated solely by the love of what is good and right, never violate their faith, nor dissemble the truth.—From this doctrine follows, VI. that severe and rigid discipline of the old Anabaptists, which produced so many commotions among them.¹

§ 17. The Mennonites have a system of morals (or, at least, once had; whether they still retain it, is uncertain) coinciding with that fundamental doctrine which was the source of their other peculiarities; that is, one which is austere and rigid. For those who believe that sanctity of life is the only indication of a true church, must be especially careful, lest any appearance of sinful conduct should stain the lives of their people. Hence, they all taught formerly, that *Jesus Christ* established a new law for human conduct, far more perfect than the old law of Moses and of the ancient prophets: and they would not tolerate in their churches any whom they perceived swerving from extreme gravity and simplicity, in their attitudes, looks, clothing, and style of living, or whose desires extended beyond the bare necessities of life, or who imitated the customs of the world, or showed any regard for the laws of etiquette. But this ancient austerity became, in a great measure, extinct in the larger associations, particularly among the Waterlanders and the Germans, after they had acquired wealth, by merchandise and by other occupations: so that at this day the Mennonite congregations furnish their pastors with as much matter of censure and admonition as the other Christian communities do.² Some of the smaller associations, however, and

¹ [This derivation of the Anabaptist tenets from one single principle, although it appears forced, especially in regard to the second and third points, yet must be admitted to be ingenious. But whether it is historically true, is another question. Neither Menno, nor the first Anabaptists, had such disciplined intellects, as to be able thus systematically to link together their thoughts. Their tenets had been advanced, long before the Reformation, by the *Cathari*, the *Albigenses*, and the *Waldenses*, as also by the *Hussites*. This can be shown by unquestionable documents, from the records of the Inquisition, and from confessions: and Mosheim himself maintains the fact, in § 2 of this chapter. Those sects were indeed oppressed, but not exterminated. Adherents to their tenets were dispersed everywhere, in Germany, in Switzerland, in Bo-

hemia, and Moravia: and they were emboldened by the reformation to stand forth openly, to form a closer union among themselves, and to make proselytes to their tenets. From them sprang the Anabaptists, whose teachers were men, for the most part, without learning, who understood the Scriptures according to the letter, and applied the words of the Bible, without philosophical deductions, according to their perverse mode of interpretation, to their peculiar doctrines concerning the church, anabaptism, wars, capital punishments, oaths, &c. Even their doctrine concerning magistrates, they derived from Luke xxii. 25, and 1 Cor. vi. 1; and the manner in which they were treated by the magistrates, may have had a considerable influence on their doctrine respecting them. *Schll.*]

² [It is certain, that the Mennonites in

likewise the people who live remote from cities, copy more closely and successfully the manners, the abstinence, and the simplicity of their fathers.

§ 18. The opinions and practices which divide the principal associations of Mennonites, if we omit those of less importance, are chiefly the following:—I. *Menno* denied that Christ received from his most holy mother that human body which he assumed: on the contrary, he thought it to have been produced out of nothing, in the perfectly chaste womb of the virgin, by the power of the Holy Ghost.¹ This opinion the *Fine Anabaptists* or the *old Flemings* still hold tenaciously; but all the other associations have long since given it up.²—

Holland, at this day, are, in their tables, their equipages, and their country-seats, the most luxurious part of the Dutch nation. This is more especially true of the Mennonites of *Amsterdam*, who are very numerous and extremely opulent.' *Macl.*—This was written about the year 1764, and at the *Hague*, in South Holland, where Dr. Mac-laine spent nearly his whole life. It is therefore the testimony of an *eye-witness*, residing on the spot. *Tr.*]

¹ Thus the opinion of Menno is stated by Herman Schyn, *Plenior Deductio Historiæ Mennonitar.* p. 164, 165: but others report it differently. After considering some passages in Menno's writings, in which he treats expressly on this subject, I think it most probable that he was very much inclined to this opinion; and that it was solely in this sense that he ascribed to Christ a divine and celestial body. For whatever comes immediately from the Holy Spirit, may be fitly called celestial and divine. Yet I must confess, that Menno appears not to have been so certain of this opinion, as never to have thought of exchanging it for a better. For he expresses himself, here and there, ambiguously and inconsistently: from which I conclude, that he gave up the common opinion respecting the origin of Christ's human body; but was in doubt, which of the various opinions that occurred to his thoughts to adopt in the place of it. See Fuesslin's *Centuria I. Epistolar. a Reformatore. Helveticis Scriptarum*, p. 383, &c. Menno is commonly represented as the *author* of this doctrine, concerning the origin of Christ's body, which his more rigid disciples still retain. But it appears to have been older than Menno, and to have been only adopted, by him, together with other opinions of the Anabaptists. For John Fabricius Boland (*Motus Monasteriensis*, lib. x. v. 49, &c.) expressly testifies of many of the Anabaptists of Münster (who certainly received no instructions from Menno), that they held this opinion concerning the body of Christ:—

Esse (Christum) Deum statuunt alii, sed corpore carnem

Humanam sumpto sustinuisse negant:

At Diam mentem tenuis quasi fauce canalis

Per Mariæ corpus virginis isse ferunt.

[It is very probable, that this doctrine was propagated from the Manichæans of the middle ages to the Anabaptists. For thus Moneta, at least, says, in his *Summa adv. Catharos et Waldenses*, lib. iii. c. iii. 'Dicunt (*Cathari*) quod corpus spirituale accepit (Christus) operatione Spiritus Sancti, ex alia materia fabricatum.' *Schl.*—And is it not probable, likewise, that most, if not all, the peculiar sentiments of the old Anabaptists of Germany originated from the influence of that Manichæan leaven, which was introduced into Europe in the ninth century, by the *Paulicians*; and which spread far, and produced, from that time onward, various fanatical and enthusiastic sects, quite down to the time of the Reformation? See the *History of the Paulicians*, in cent. ix. pt. ii. ch. v. and the *Chapters on Heresies*, in the subsequent centuries. *Tr.*]

² I perceive that many represent the *Waterlanders*, especially, as acceding to this doctrine of Menno respecting Christ's body. See *Histoire des Anabaptistes*, p. 223. *Cérémonies et Coutumes de tous les Peuples du Monde*, iv. 200. But the *Confession* of the Waterlanders, or that of John Ries, will itself confute this error. Add Herm. Schyn's *Deductio Plenior Historiæ Mennonitar.* p. 165. [Rues (p. 16) attributes this doctrine solely to the *old Flemings*; yet subjoining, as their opinion, that the human nature of Christ, which God first created out of nothing, received its support and growth from the blood of the holy Virgin Mary. At the same time, they explicitly guarded themselves against the charge of partaking in the error of the *Valentinians*, by this doctrine. Menno embraced this doctrine, as Rues also maintains, because he could not conceive, how the human nature of Christ could be without sin, if it be admitted, that it descended from Mary. But

II. The more rigid Mennonites, after the example of their ancestors, regard as disciplinable offences, not only those wicked actions which are manifestly violations of the law of God, but likewise the slightest indications either of a latent inclination to sensuality, or of a mind unsedate and inclined to follow the customs of the world: as, for example, ornaments for the head, elegant clothing, rich and unnecessary furniture, and the like; and all transgressors, they think, should be excommunicated, without previous admonition; and no allowance be made for the weakness of human nature. But the other Mennonites think, that none deserve excommunication, but contemners of the divine law, and such also as pertinaciously disregard the admonitions of the church.—III. The more rigid Mennonites hold, that excommunicated persons are to be shunned, as if they were pests, and are to be deprived of all social intercourse. Hence the ties of kindred must be severed, and the voice of nature must be unheeded. Parents must not look upon their children, nor wives upon their husbands, or converse with them, or manifest affection, or perform any kind of offices for them, when the church has once pronounced them unworthy of her communion. But the more moderate think, that the sanctity and honour of the church are sufficiently consulted, if all particular intimacy with the excommunicated is avoided.—IV. The old Flemings maintain, that the example of *Christ*, which has in this instance the force of a law, requires his disciples to wash the feet of their guests, in token of their love: and for this reason they have been called *Podoniptæ*.¹ But others deny that this rite was enjoined by Christ.

§ 19. Literature and whatever comes under the name of learning, but especially philosophy, this whole sect formerly considered as exceedingly prejudicial to the church of Christ, and to the progress of religion and piety. Hence, although it can boast of a number of writers in this century, yet not one of them can afford pleasure to the reader, by either his genius or his learning. The more rigid Mennonites retain this sentiment of their predecessors, quite to our times; and therefore, despising the cultivation of their minds, they devote themselves to hand-labour, the mechanic arts, and traffic. But the *Waterlanders* are honourably distinguished from the others, in this, as well as in many other respects. For they permit several of their members to prosecute at the universities the study of languages, history, antiquities, and especially the medical art, the utility of which they are unable to deny. And hence it is, that so many of their ministers, at the present day, bear the title of Doctors of Physic. In our age these milder and more discreet Anabaptists pursue also the study of philosophy; and they regard it as very useful to mankind. Hence, among their teachers, there are not a few who have the title of Masters of Philosophy. Nay more, only a few years since, they established a college at Amsterdam, in which

his disciples, for proof, appeal to 1 Corinth. xv. 47, and John vi. 51. *Schl.*]

¹ [Feet-washers. *Tr.*]

a man of erudition sustains the office of Professor of Philosophy. Yet they persevere still in the opinion, that theology must be kept pure and uncontaminated with philosophy, and never be modified by its precepts. Even the more rigid *Flemings* also, in our times, are gradually laying aside their ancient hatred of literature and science, and permitting their members to study languages, history, and other branches of learning.

§ 20. That ignorance, which the ancient Anabaptists reckoned among the means of their felicity, contributed much, indeed very much, to generate sects among them; with which they abounded from the first, much more than any other religious community. This will be readily conceded, by any one that looks into the causes and grounds of the dissensions among them. For their vehement contests were, for the most part, not so much respecting the doctrines and the mysteries of religion, as respecting what is to be esteemed *lawful, proper, pious, right, and commendable*; and what, on the contrary, is to be accounted *criminal and faulty*. Because they maintained, that sanctity of life and purity of manners were the only sign of a true church: yet what was holy and religious, and what not so, they did not determine by reason and judgment, nor by a correct interpretation of the divine laws (because they had no men who possessed solid knowledge on moral subjects), but rather by their feelings and imaginations. Now, as this mode of discriminating good from evil is fluctuating and various, according to the different capacities and temperaments of men, it was unavoidable, that different opinions should arise among them; and these, nowhere, more certainly produce permanent schisms, than among a people who are ignorant, and therefore pertinacious.

§ 21. A quiet and stable residence in the United Provinces of Belgium was first procured for the Mennonites by *William* prince of Orange, the immortal vindicator of Batavian liberty; whom the Mennonites had aided with a large sum of money, in the year 1572, when he was destitute of the resources necessary for his vast undertakings.¹ Yet the benefits of this indulgence reached, by slow degrees, to all that resided in Holland. For opposition was made to the will of the prince, both by the magistrates and by the clergy; especially by those of Zealand and Amsterdam, who remembered the

¹ Gerh. Brandt's *Historie de Reformatie in de Nedderlande*, vol. i. book x. p. 525, 526. *Cérémonies et Coutumes de tous les Peuples du Monde*, iv. 201. [*General History of the United Netherlands* (in German), iii. 317, &c. Wagenaer, in the passage here referred to, relates the matter thus. At Middelburg, because the Anabaptists would not take the citizen's oath, it was resolved to exclude them from the privileges of citizenship, or at least not to admit them fully to the rank of citizens. But the prince opposed it; and maintained, very rationally, that an Anabaptist's affirmation ought to be

held equivalent to an oath; and that in this case, no further coercion could be used with them, unless we would justify the Catholics in compelling the reformed, by force, to adopt a mode of worship from which their consciences revolted. And afterwards, when the city council demanded of them to mount guard, and threatened, if they refused, to close their shops, the prince commanded the city council, peremptorily, to trouble the Anabaptists no more, for declining oaths and the bearing of arms. This took place in 1578. *Schl.*]

seditions raised by the Anabaptists but a short time previously.¹ These impediments [to their peace] were, in a great measure, removed in this century, partly by the perseverance and authority of *William* and his son *Maurice*, and partly by the good behaviour of the Mennonites themselves; for they showed great proofs of their loyalty to the state, and became daily more cautious not to afford any ground to their adversaries for entertaining suspicions of them. Yet full and complete peace was first given to them, in the following century, A.D. 1626, after they had again purged themselves from those crimes and pernicious errors which were charged upon them, by the presentation of a *Confession* of their faith.²

§ 22. Those among the English who reject the baptism of infants, are not called *Anabaptists*, but only *Baptists*. It is probable that these *Baptists* originated from the Germans and the Dutch, and that they all once held the same sentiments with the *Mennonites*. But they are now divided into two general classes; the one called that of the *General Baptists*, or *Remonstrants*, because they believe that God has excluded no man from salvation by any sovereign decree; the other are called *Particular* or *Calvinistic Baptists*, because they agree very nearly with the Calvinists or Presbyterians in their religious sentiments.³ This latter sect reside chiefly at London, and in the adjacent towns and villages: and they recede so far from earlier holders of their opinions, that they have scarcely anything in common with the other Anabaptists, except that they baptize none but adults, and immerse totally in the water whomever they initiate in their religion. Hence, if the government requires it, they allow a professor of religion to take an oath, to bear arms, and to fill public civil offices. Their churches are organised after the *Presbyterian*⁴ plan; and are under the direction of men of learning and literature.⁵ It appears from the *Confession* of these Baptists, published in 1643, that they then held the same sentiments that they do at the present day.⁶

¹ Gerh. Brandt, *loc. cit.* book xi. p. 555, 586, 587, &c. 609, 610, b. xiv. p. 780, b. xvi. p. 811.

² Herm. Schyn's *Plenior Deductio Historie Mennonitar.* c. iv. p. 79, &c.

³ William Whiston, *Memoirs of his Life and Writings*, ii. 461.

⁴ [Or more strictly, the *Independent*. *Tr.*]

⁵ Anth. Wilh. Böhm's *Englische Reformations-historie*, p. 151, 473, 536, book viii. p. 1152, &c. [Crosby's *History of the English Baptists*, vol. i. Bogue and Bennet's *History of the Dissenters*, vol. i. ch. i. § iii. p. 141, &c. Dutch and German Anabaptists or Mennonites appeared in England, and doubtless made some proselytes there, as early as 1535; and thenceforward to the end of the century. But they were so rigorously persecuted, not only by Henry VIII., but by Edward VI., queen Mary, and queen Elizabeth, that they can hardly be said to have existed as a visible sect in England

during the sixteenth century. And their division into *General* and *Particular* Baptists did not take place till the reign of James I. See Wall's *Hist. of Infant Baptism*, pt. ii. ch. vii. § 6, p. 206, &c. *Tr.*]

⁶ *Bibliothèque Britannique*, vi. 2. [The Baptist Confession of 1643 was 'set forth in the name of seven congregations then gathered in London.' In September, 1689, elders and messengers from upwards of one hundred congregations of Calvinistic Baptists in England and Wales, met in London, and drew up a more full Confession, and substantially the same in doctrine; but expressed very much in the words of the Westminster and the Savoy Confessions, with both which it agrees in doctrine, while in discipline and worship it accords only with the latter. The Calvinistic Baptists in England have generally been on the most friendly terms with the Independents or Congregationalists there; and often both sects worshipped together, and were under

§ 23. The *General Baptists*, or, as some call them, the *Antipædobaptists*, who are dispersed in great numbers over many provinces of England, consist of illiterate persons of low condition: for, like the ancient *Mennonites*, they despise learning. Their religion is very general and indefinite; so that they tolerate persons of all sects, even Arians and Socinians; and do not reject any person, provided he professes to be a Christian, and to receive the holy Scriptures as the rule of faith and practice in religion.¹ They have this in common with the *Particular Baptists*, that they baptize only adults, and these they immerse wholly in water: but they differ from them in this, that they rebaptize such as were either baptized only in infancy and childhood, or were not immersed; which, if report may be credited, the *Particular Baptists* will not do.² There are likewise other peculiarities of this sect.—I. Like the ancient *Mennonites*, they regard their own church as being the only true church of Christ, and most carefully avoid communion with all other religious communities.—II. They immerse candidates for baptism only once, and not three times; and they esteem it unessential, whether new converts be baptized in the name of the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, or only in the name of *Jesus*.—III. With *Menno* they expect a millennial reign of Christ.—IV. Many of them, likewise, adopt *Menno's* opinion respecting the origin of Christ's body.—V. They consider the decree of the Apostles, Acts xv. 25, respecting blood and things strangled, to be a law binding on the church universal.—VI. They believe that the soul, between death and the resurrection at the last day, has neither pleasure nor pain, but is in a state of insensibility.—VII. They use extreme unction.—VIII. Some of them, in addition to Sunday or the Lord's Day, keep also the *Jewish Sabbath*.³ I omit the notice of some minor points. These Baptists

the same pastors. See Bogue and Bennet's *History of Dissenters*, i. 142, 143, ii. 140, &c. also the *Confession of the Baptist Convention* of 1689, and its Preface. *Tr.*]

¹ This appears from their Confession, drawn up in 1660, and published by Wm. Whiston, *Memoirs of his Life*, ii. 561, which is so general, that all Christian sects, with the exception of a few points, could embrace it. Whiston himself, though an Arian, joined this community of Baptists, whom he considered to bear the nearest resemblance to the most ancient Christians. Thomas Emlyn also, a famous Socinian, lived among them, according to the testimony of Whiston.

² [I know not on what authority Dr. Mosheim makes this distinction between the General and the Particular Baptists; and I know of no sufficient proof of its reality. Neither does it appear, as Dr. Mosheim seemed to have been informed, that the General Baptists were more numerous in England than the Particular Baptists. On the contrary, I suppose the former to

have always been the smaller community; and at the present day, they are only about one-sixth part as numerous as the Particular Baptists. See Bogue and Bennet, *l. c.* iv. 328. *Tr.*]

³ These statements are derived from Wm. Whiston's *Memoirs of his Life*, ii. 461, and from Wall's *Hist. of Infant Baptism*, pt. ii. p. 390, &c. ed. Latin. [p. 280, &c. ed. London, 1705.—Wall does not represent all these as distinguishing tenets of the *General Baptists*. He enumerates the various peculiarities to be found among the *English Baptists*, of all sorts. Some of the peculiarities mentioned constitute distinct sects; as the eighth, which gives rise to the small, and now almost extinct sect of *Seventh-day Baptists*, who, however, do not keep both days, *Saturday* and *Sunday*, but only the former. The second peculiarity, so far as respects a *single application* of water, is not peculiar to the *Baptists*: and so far as it respects baptizing *in the name of Jesus* only, was confined (as Wall supposed) to the *General Baptists*, who were

have bishops, whom they call messengers (for thus they interpret the word *ἄγγελος*, in the Apocalyptical epistles), and *presbyters* and *deacons*. Their *bishops* are often men of learning.¹

§ 24. *David George*,² a Hollander of Delft, gave origin and name to a singular sect. He, in the end, forsook the Anabaptists, retired to Bâle, in 1544, assumed a new name,³ and there died, in 1556. He was well esteemed by the people of Bâle, so long as he lived; for being a man of wealth, he united magnificence with virtue and integrity. But after his death, his son-in-law, *Nicholas Blesdyck*, accused him before the senate of most pestilent errors; and the cause being tried, his body was committed to the common hangman, to be burnt. Nothing can be more impious and base than his opinions, if the historians of his case, and his adversaries, have estimated them correctly. For he is said to have declared himself to be a third *David*, and another son of God, the fountain of all divine wisdom; to have denied the existence of heaven and hell, both good and bad angels, and a final judgment; to have treated all the laws of modesty and decorum with contempt; and to have taught other things equally bad.⁴ But if I do not greatly

early inclined to Anti-Trinitarianism, and of late, in England, have generally taken that ground. *Tr.*]

¹ Whiston, *Memoirs of his Life*, ii. 466, &c. There is extant, Thomas Crosby's *History of the English Baptists*, Lond. 1728, 4 vols. 8vo, which, however, I have never seen. [This Crosby was himself a *General Baptist*; and kept a private school, in which he taught young men mathematics; and had also a small book-shop. He died in 1752. See Alberti's *Letters on the most recent state of religion and learning in England* (in German), preface to vol. iv. From Crosby, Alberti has translated the Confessions of both the Particular and the General Baptists into German, and subjoined them as an Appendix to his fourth volume, p. 1245, &c. and 1323, &c. *Schl.* — The Rev. John Smyth is commonly represented as the father of the sect of *General or Arminian Baptists* in England. (See Bogue and Bennet, *Hist. of Dissenters*, i. 150.) He was fellow of Christ's college, Cambridge, a popular preacher, and a great sufferer for nonconformity. Separating from the Church of England, he joined the Brownists; was one of their leading men in 1592, and was imprisoned during eleven months. At length he fled, with other Brownists, to Holland; and in 1606 joined the English Brownist church at Amsterdam. Here he fell into Arminian and Baptist opinions, on which he had disputes with Ainsworth, Robinson, and others; and removed, with his adherents, to Leyden, where he died in 1610. Soon after his death, his followers returned to England; and, as is

generally supposed, they were the first congregation of English General Baptists. See his life in Brook's *Lives of the Puritans*, ii. 195, &c. *Tr.*]

² [Or Joris. *Tr.*]

³ [John Bruck von Binnengen. *Tr.*]

⁴ See the *Historia Davidis Georgii*, by his son-in-law, Nic. Blesdyck, published by Jac. Revius: also his *Life*, written in German, by Jac. Stoltzerforth; and many others. See among the more modern writers, Godfr. Arnold, *Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*, vol. i. b. xvi. ch. xxi. § 44, &c. p. 750, &c. and his extensive collections, in vindication of the reputation of David George, in vol. ii. p. 534, &c. See also p. 1186, &c. and Henry More's *Enthusiasmus triumphatus*, sect. xxxiii. &c. p. 23, &c. Add especially the documents which are brought into light, in my *History of Michael Servetus* (in German), p. 425, &c. [David Joris was born at Delft, in 1501. Though placed at school, he learned nothing. But his inclination led him to learn the art of painting on glass, which caused him to travel in the Netherlands, France, and England. Returning in 1524, he pursued that business in his native town. The Reformation here caused considerable commotion; and in 1530, Joris, for obstructing a Roman Catholic procession, was imprisoned, whipped, and had his tongue bored. He at length turned to the Anabaptists; but being more moderate than they, and opposed to their tumultuous proceedings, it was not till 1534, that he actually was rebaptized. He now joined the party of *Hofmann*: but he was not well pleased with any of them: and at

mistake, the barbarous and coarse style of the man, who possessed some genius, but no learning, led his opponents often to put a rather harsh and unfair construction upon his sentiments. At all events, that he possessed something more of sense and virtue, than is commonly supposed, is shown not only by his books, of which he published a great many, but also by his disciples, persons by no means base, and of great simplicity of manners and character, who were formerly numerous in Holstein, and are said to be so still, in Friesland, and in other countries.¹ In the manner of the more moderate Anabaptists, he laboured to revive languishing piety among his fellow-men: and in this matter, his imagination, which was excessively warm, so deceived him, that he rashly supposed himself favoured with divine visions; and he placed religion in the exclusion of all external objects, silence, contemplation, and a peculiar and indescribable state of the soul. The *Mystics*, therefore, of the highest order, and the *Quakers* might claim him if they would; and might assign him no mean rank among their people.

§ 25. An intimate friend of *David George*, but of a somewhat different turn of mind, *Henry Nicolai*, of Westphalia, gave much trouble to the Dutch and the English, from the year 1555, by founding and propagating the *Family of Love*, as he denominated his sect. To this man nearly the same remarks apply that were made of his friend. He would perhaps have been, in great measure, free from the foul blots that many have fastened upon him, if he had possessed the genius and learning requisite to a correct and lucid expression of his thoughts. What his aims were, appears pretty clearly, from the *name* of the sect which he set up.² For he declared himself divinely appointed, and sent to teach mankind that the whole of religion consists in the exercise of *love*; that all other

length, he united some contending parties together, and actually established a particular sect of Anabaptists. He now began to have visions and revelations. As his adherents suffered persecution in Westphalia and Holland, he often attended them, and comforted and animated them in their dying hours. He saw his own mother decapitated at Delft, in 1537. A monitory letter which he sent to the senate of Holland, caused the bearer to lose his head. In 1539, the landgrave of Hesse, to whom he applied for protection, offered to afford it, provided he would become a Lutheran. In 1542, he published his famous Book of Wonders, in which he exposed all the fanciful opinions that floated in his imagination. He wandered in various countries, till he was safe nowhere. Therefore, in 1544, he retired to Bâle, where he lived twelve years, under the name of John von Brügge; was owner of a house in the city, and an estate in the country; was a peaceable and good citizen, and held communion with the Reformed church. His son-in-law, Blesdyck, was a

reformed preacher in the Palatinate; and had some variance with Joris before his death. Afterwards, provoked perhaps by the disposition Joris made of his property, he brought heavy charges against him. His family, and friends, and acquaintances, denied the truth of the charges before the court. But what they would not admit, was attempted to be proved from his writings. The university and the clergy pronounced his opinions heretical; and the dead man, who could no longer defend himself, was condemned. See Schroeckh's *Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation*, v. 442, &c. and Von Einem's and Schlegel's notes upon this section of Mosheim. *Tr.*]

¹ See Jo. Möller's *Introductio in Histor. Chersones. Cimbricæ*, pt. ii. p. 116, &c. and his *Cimbria Litterata*, i. 422, &c.

² See Jo. Hornbeck's *Summa Controversiarum*, l. vi. p. 393. Godfr. Arnold's *Kirchen- und Ketzzer-historie*, pt. i. book xvi. ch. xxi. § 36, p. 746. Ant. Wilh. Böhm's *Englische Reformations-historie*, book iv. ch. v. p. 541, &c.

things which are supposed to belong to religion, are of no importance: and of course that it is of no consequence what views any one has of the divine nature, provided he burns with a flame of piety and love. To these opinions he perhaps added some other fanciful views, as is usual with men in whom the imagination predominates: but what they were in particular, I apprehend, may be better learned from his books, than from the confutations of his adversaries.¹

CHAPTER VII.

HISTORY OF THE SOCINIANS.

§ 1, 2. The name and origin of the Socinians—§ 3. Their first beginnings—§ 4. Michael Servetus—§ 5. His doctrines—§ 6. Other Anti-Trinitarians—§ 7. False originations of Socinianism—§ 8. Its true origination—§ 9. Its progress—§ 10. Summary view of this religion—§ 11. Proceedings of Faustus Socinus—§ 12. He modified the Unitarian religion—§ 13. Propagation of Socinianism in Transylvania and Hungary—§ 14. In Holland and England—§ 15. The foundation of this religion—§ 16. Its fundamental principle—§ 17. Summary of it—§ 18. Moral principles—§ 19. Racovian Catechism—§ 20. State of learning among Socinians—§ 21. Method of teaching theology—§ 22. Controversies of the Socinians: Budneists or Budneans—§ 23. Succeeded by Davides, Francken, and others—§ 24. The Farnovian sect.

§ 1. THE *Socinians* derive their name from the illustrious house of *Sozzini*, which long flourished at Siena, a very noble city of Tuscany,

¹ The last and most learned of those who attacked the *Familists*, was Henry More, the celebrated English divine and philosopher, in his *Mystery of Godliness*, book vi. ch. xii—xviii. George Fox, the father of the Quakers, severely chastised this *Familist* of *Love*, because they would take an oath, dance, sing, and be cheerful; and he called them a company of fanatics. See Sewel's *History of the Quakers*, book iii. p. 88, 89, 344, &c. [Henry Nicolai, or Nicolas, was born at Münster, and commenced his career about 1546, in the Netherlands; thence he passed over to England, in the latter years of Edward VI., and joined the Dutch congregation in London. But his sect did not become visible till some time in the reign of queen Elizabeth. In 1575, they laid a Confession of their faith, with a number of their books, before the parliament, and prayed for toleration. In 1580, the queen and her council undertook to suppress them. They continued in England till the middle of the following century, when they became absorbed in other sects. Nicolai published a number of tracts and letters in Dutch, for the edification of his followers, and to vindicate his principles against gainsayers. In one of his pieces, he mystically styles him-

self: 'A man whom God had awaked from the dead, anointed and filled with the Holy Ghost, endowed with God, in the spirit of his love, and elevated with Christ to an inheritance in heavenly blessings, enlightened with the Spirit of heavenly truth, and with the true light of the all-perfect Being.' In his preface to one of his tracts he calls himself: 'The chosen servant of God, by whom the heavenly revelation should again be made known to the world.' His followers, in 1575, affirmed, that they did not deny *that* baptism, which consisted in repentance and newness of life: nor the holy sacrament of baptism, which betokened the new birth in Christ, and which was to be administered to children: that they admitted also the perfect satisfaction made by Christ for the sins of men.—They appeared always cheerful, and in a happy state of mind; which offended the more gloomy mystics, and produced heavy charges against them. Yet nothing appeared in their moral conduct to justify those criminations. Arnold's *Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*, pt. ii. b. xvi. c. 21, § 36, p. 873, ed. Schaffhausen; and Schroeckh's *Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation*, v. 478, &c. *Tr*].

and is said to have produced extraordinary men: for from this family originated *Laelius* and *Faustus Socinus*, who are commonly regarded as the parents of the sect. *Laelius Socinus* was the son of *Marianus*, a celebrated lawyer; and to great learning and talents, he added—as even his enemies acknowledge—a pure and blameless life. Leaving his native country, from religious considerations, in 1547, he travelled over various countries, France, England, Holland, Germany, and Poland; everywhere examining carefully the opinions of such as had abandoned the Roman church concerning God and divine things, for the sake of discovering and finding the truth. At length he settled down at Zurich, in Switzerland, and there died in the year 1562, when he was not yet forty years old.¹ Being a man of mild and gentle spirit, and averse from all contention, he adopted the *Helvetic Confession*, and wished to be thought a member of the Swiss church: yet he did not absolutely conceal his doubts on religious subjects; but proposed them in his letters to learned friends with whom he was intimate.² But *Faustus Socinus*, his nephew and heir, is said to have drawn from the writings left by *Laelius*, his real sentiments concerning religion, and, by publishing them, to have gathered the sect.

§ 2. The name *Socinians* is often used in two different senses; a proper and an improper, or a limited and a more general. For in common speech, all are denominated *Socinians*, who teach doctrines akin to those of the Socinians; and especially those who either wholly deny, or weaken and render dubious, the Christian doctrine of three Persons in the Godhead, and the divine nature of our Saviour. But in a more limited sense, those only are called Socinians who receive either entire, or in its principal parts, that system of religion which *Faustus Socinus* either produced himself, or set forth when produced by his uncle, and recommended to the *Unitarian brethren* (as they themselves wish to be called) living in Poland and Transylvania.³

¹ Jo. Cloppenburg, *Diss. de Origine et Progressu Socinianismi*. Jo. Hornbeck, *Summa Controversiarum*, p. 563, &c. Jo. Henry Hottinger, *Historia Ecclesiast.* ix. 417, &c. and others.

² Hieron. Zanchius, *Præfatio ad librum de tribus Elohim*. Theod. Beza, *Epistolar. Volumen*, ep. lxxxi. p. 167. Several writings are ascribed to him (see Sand's *Bibliotheca Antitrinitar.* p. 68): but it is very doubtful whether he was the author of any one of them.

³ There is still wanting a full and accurate history, both of the sect which follows the Socini, and of *Laelius* and *Faustus Socinus*, and those most active with them in establishing and building up this community. For the curiosity of those who wish to acquire an accurate knowledge of this whole subject, is awakened, but not satisfied, by what they find in John Hornbeck's *Socinianismus Confutatus*, vol. i. Abraham

Calovius, *Opera Anti-Sociniana*; Jo. Cloppenburg's *Diss. de Origine et Progressu Socinianismi* (*Opp.* tom. ii. Lugd. Bat. 1708, 4to). Christopher Sandius, *Bibliotheca Antitrinitariorum*: Stanis. Lubieniecius, *Historia Reformationis Polonicae*: Sam. Fred. Lauterbach's *Polnisch-Arianischen Socinianismus*, Francf. 1725, 8vo. And the *Histoire du Socinianisme*, by Lamy, Paris, 1723, 4to, is a compilation from the common writers, and abounds not only with errors, but likewise with various matter quite foreign from a history of the Socinian sect and religion. The very industrious and learned Maturin Veiss la Croze promised the world a complete history of Socinianism down to our times; see his *Dissert. Historiques*, i. 142. But he did not fulfil his promise. [Besides the above, there are G. G. Zeltner's *Historia Crypto-Socinianismi Altorfinae quondam academicae infestæ Arcana*, Lips. 1729, 4to. J. Toulmin's *Memoirs of*

§ 3. While the Reformation was still immature, certain persons, who looked upon everything which the Roman church had hitherto professed as erroneous, began to undermine the doctrine of our Saviour's divinity, and the truths connected with it; and proposed reducing the whole of religion to practical piety and virtue. But the vigilance as well of the Lutherans, as of the Reformed and Papists, promptly resisted them, and prevented them from organising a sect. As early as the year 1526, divine honours were denied to Jesus Christ by *Lewis Helzer*, a name famous among the vagrant Anabaptists, and who was beheaded at Constance in 1529.¹ Nor were there wanting other men of like sentiments among the Anabaptists, though that whole sect cannot be charged with this error. Besides these, *John Campanus*, of Juliers, in what year is not ascertained, among other unsound doctrines, which he spread at Wittemberg and elsewhere, made the Son of God to be inferior to the Father; and declared the appellation *Holy Spirit* to denote, not a divine *person*, but the *nature* both of the Father and the Son; that is, he revived, in substance, the monstrous errors of the Arians.² In the territory of the Grisons, in Switzerland, and at Strasburg, one *Claudius*, an Allobrogian or Savoyard, excited much commotion, about the year 1530 and afterwards, by impugning the divinity of our Saviour.³ But none of these were able to establish a sect.

the life, character, sentiments, and writings of Faustus Socinus, Lond. 1777, 8vo. F. Sam. Bock's *Historia Antitrinitariorum, maxime Socinianismi et Socinianorum, quorum auctores, promotores, cætus, templa recensentur*; Königsb. 1774—84, 2 vols. 8vo. (The first vol. gives an account of modern Socinian authors; and the second traces the origin of Antitrinitarianism. The whole, therefore, is only a broad introduction to a proper history of the Socinian community.) Ch. F. Ilgen, *Vita Lælii Socini*, Lips. 1814, 8vo. Tr.]

¹ Christ. Sand's *Bibliotheca Antitrinitarior.* p. 16. Jo. Bapt. Ottius, *Annales Anabaptist.* p. 50. Jo. Ja. Breiting's *Museum Helveticum*, v. 391, v. 100, 479, &c. [See above, c. vi. § 5, note. Tr.]

² See Jo. Geo. Schelhorn's very learned Dissertation, *de Joh. Campano, Anti-Trinitario*; in his *Amœnitates Litterar.* xi. 1—92. [He was a native of Mæscyk, in the territory of Liège, and came to Wittemberg in 1528; but so concealed his opinions, that they first became known after he had retired to Marburg; where he wished to take part in the public dispute, and to debate with Luther on the subject of the Lord's Supper; but was refused. He repeated the same at Torgau, where he likewise sought in vain to dispute with Luther. This filled him with resentment against Luther and his associates, and induced him to quit Wittemberg (to which he had returned), and go to

Niemek; the pastor of which, Wicelius, fell under suspicion of Antitrinitarianism, in consequence of his harbouring Campanus, and soon after went over to the Catholics. Campanus went from Saxony to the duchy of Juliers; and both orally, and in writing, declared himself opposed to the Reformers, and sought, underhandedly, to disseminate his Arian doctrines. But he was committed to prison by the Catholics, at Cleves; and continued in confinement twenty-six years. Whether he made his escape from prison, or was set at liberty, is not known. All we know is that he lived to a great age. The substance of his doctrine may be learned from the very scarce book, *The divine and holy Scripture, many years since obscured, and darkened by unwholesome doctrine and teachers, (by God's permission) restored and amended by the very learned John Campanus*, 1532, 8vo (in German). Schl.]

³ See Jo. Geo. Schelhorn's Epistolary Dissertation, *de Mino Celso Senensi, Claudio item Allobroge, homine fanatico et SS. Trinitatis hoste*; Ulm. 1748, 8vo. Jo. Jac. Breiting's *Museum Helveticum*, vii. 667. Jo. Haller's Epistle, in Jo. Conr. Fuesslin's *Centuria Epistolar. Viror. Eruditor.* 140, &c. [He first held Christ to be a mere man; but the Swiss divines brought him to admit, that he was the natural Son of God; though he would not allow his eternal existence; and he positively denied three Persons in the Godhead. He also maintained, that

§ 4. Those who watched over the interests of the reformed church, were much more alarmed by the conduct of *Michael Servetus*,¹ or *Servetus*, as his name is written in Latin, a Spanish physician, born at Villa Nueva in Arragon, a man of no ordinary genius, and of extensive knowledge. He first published, in 1531, seven books, *de Trinitatis Erroribus*; and the next year, two Dialogues, *de Trinitate*; in which he most violently assailed the opinion, held by the great body of Christians, respecting the divine nature and the three Persons in it. Subsequently, after retiring to France, and passing through various scenes, he fixed his residence at Vienne, where he was a successful practitioner of physic; and now, by his strong power of imagination, he devised a new and singular species of religion, which he committed to a book that he secretly printed at Vienne in 1553, and which he entitled *Restitutio Christianismi*.² Many things seemed to conspire to favour his designs: genius, learning, eloquence, courage, pertinacity, a show of piety, and lastly, numerous patrons and friends in France, Germany, and Italy, whom he had conciliated by his natural and acquired endowments. But all his hopes were frustrated by *Calvin*; who caused *Servetus* to be seized at Geneva, after his escape from prison at Vienne, and as he was passing through Switzerland towards Italy, and to be accused of blasphemy by a servant. The issue of the accusation was, that *Servetus*, as he would not renounce the opinions that he had embraced, was burnt alive, by a decree of the judges, as an obstinate heretic and blasphemer. For in that age, the ancient laws against heretics, enacted by the emperor *Frederick II.*, and often renewed afterwards, were in full force at Geneva. A better fate was merited by this man of uncommon genius and great learning: yet he laboured under no small moral defects: for he was, beyond all measure, arrogant, atrabilious, contentious, unyielding; in short, he was half mad.³

the beginning of John's Gospel had been falsified. He was imprisoned at Strasburg, and then banished. Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation*, v. 491. Tr.]

¹ By rejecting the last syllable of the name, which is a common Spanish termination, there remains the name *Serve*: and the letters of this name, a little transposed, produce *Reves*; which is the name *Servetus* assumed in the title-pages of his books. Omitting also his family name, altogether, he called himself, from his birthplace, *Michael Villanovanus*, or simply, *Villanovanus*.

² [A Restoration of Christianity. Tr.]

³ I have composed, in the German language, a copious history of this man, who was so unlike everybody but himself; which was published at Helmstadt, 1748, 4to, and again, with large additions, Helmst. 1749, 4to. [MacLaine recommends to those who cannot read the German, a juvenile production of one of Mosheim's pupils, composed twenty years earlier, entitled, *Historia Mich. Serveti, quam, præside J. Laur.*

Mosheimio, &c. exponit Henricus ab Allwaerden, Helmst. 1727, 4to. But Mosheim, in his history of Servetus, pronounces this an incorrect performance, and not to be relied on. Von Einem here introduces, in a note of 23 pages, an epitome of Mosheim's history of Servetus. The account which Schroeckh gives of Servetus (*Kirchengesch. seit der Reformat.* v. 519, &c.) accords in general with that of Mosheim, as abridged by Von Einem. From both these the following sketch is made:—

He was born at Villa Nueva, in Arragon, A.D. 1509. His father was a lawyer, and sent him to Toulouse to study law. But he preferred literature and theology. Hebrew, Greek, the Fathers, the Bible, and the writings of the Reformers, seem to have engaged his chief attention. On his return to Spain, he connected himself with Jo. Quintana, confessor to the emperor Charles V.; and accompanied him to Italy, where he witnessed the emperor's coronation at Bologna, A.D. 1529. The year following, he

§ 5. *Servetus* had devised a strange system of religion ; a great part of which was intimately connected with his notions of the nature of

accompanied Quintana into Germany; and perhaps was at Augsburg, when the Protestants presented their Confession of faith; and he might there first become acquainted with Bucer and Capito. When and where he separated from Quintana, does not appear. But in 1530, he went to Bâle, to confer with Œcolampadius. He had now struck out a new path in theology. He rejected the doctrine of three divine Persons; denied the eternal generation of the Son; and admitted no eternity of the Son, except in the purpose of God. Œcolampadius in vain attempted to bring him to other views; and laid his case before Zwingle, Bucer, Capito, and Bullinger, who all considered him a gross heretic. He left Bâle, determined to publish his projected work. It was printed at Hagenau, in 1531; and, at once, was everywhere condemned. Quintana laid it before the emperor, who ordered it to be suppressed. Servetus was assailed by his best friends wherever he went; and was pressed to abandon his errors. He therefore wrote his Dialogues, which he printed in 1532. He there condemned his former book, as a juvenile and ill-reasoned performance; yet brought forward substantially the same doctrines, and urged them with all his powers of logic and satire. In 1533, he went to Italy, and travelled in France. He studied awhile at Paris, then went to Orleans, and thence to Lyons, where he resided two years, as a superintendent of the press; held a correspondence with Calvin, and began to write his great theological work. In 1537, he went again to Paris, became a master of arts, and lectured on mathematics and astronomy. He also devoted a year to the study of physic; and now commenced medical writer and physician; yet continued to labour on his Restoration of Christianity. But soon he got into collision with the medical fraternity, and had to leave Paris. In 1538, he went to Lyons, thence to Arignon, and thence to Charlieu, where he resided as a physician till 1540. He next went again to Lyons, and soon after to Vienne, where he resided twelve years as a physician, under the patronage of the archbishop and the clergy, to whom he rendered himself quite acceptable. During this time, though still labouring secretly upon his Restoration of Christianity, he professed to be a sound catholic, and passed currently for one. He also re-edited Ptolemy's Geography, with corrections and notes; and published notes on Pagnin's Latin Bible, the chief object of which was, to show that all the Old Testament prophecies, which were commonly ap-

plied to Christ, had a previous and literal fulfilment in events prior to his advent, and only an allegorical application to him. At length he determined to print his favourite work on theology. It was worked off, in a retired house in Vienne, by his friends; and he himself corrected the press. It was finished in January, 1553; and bore on its title-page only the initials of his name. M. S. V. (Michael Servetus Villanovanus). Parcels of the book were sent to Lyons, to Frankfort, and elsewhere. A few copies reached Geneva; and Calvin was one of the first who read it. Near the end of February, one Trie, a young French protestant residing at Geneva, wrote to his catholic friend at Lyons, who laboured hard to convert him to popery, taxing the catholics of Lyons with harbouring Servetus, the impious author of this new book, which excited such universal abhorrence. This letter first awakened suspicion at Vienne, that Servetus was the author of it. A process before the Inquisition was commenced against him; but the proof was deemed insufficient. The court, however, prosecuted the matter with zeal, and obtained more and more evidence against him. Servetus, at length, foreseeing the probable result, took to flight. The court still proceeded, till they deemed the evidence sufficient, and then condemned him in his absence. Servetus fled to Geneva; and there lay concealed four weeks, waiting for an opportunity to proceed to Italy and Naples. Just as he was getting into a boat to depart, he was discovered by Calvin himself, who gave notice immediately to the government, and they apprehended him. Nicolas de la Fontaine, Calvin's secretary, took the part of an accuser; and Calvin himself is supposed to have framed the 38 articles of charge. They were taken from his writings, especially his last work; and related to his views of the Trinity and infant baptism; his taxing Moses with falsely representing the land of Canaan as very fertile; his perverting the prophecies concerning Christ; and several other points of less importance. In the first hearing, Servetus acknowledged himself the author of the books, whence the charges were drawn; but either explained away or justified the articles alleged; and La Fontaine was unable to meet his arguments. In the second hearing, Calvin was present; and he exposed the evasive pleas of the criminal. In the mean time, the council of Geneva wrote to the authorities of Vienne, informing them of the arrest of Servetus, and inquiring respecting the proceedings, against him at Vienne. The governor of the castle

things, which were also strange: nor can it be stated fully in a few words. He supposed, in general, that the true doctrine of Jesus Christ was lost, even before the council of Nice; and, indeed, that it was never taught with sufficient clearness and perspicuity: and that the restitution and explanation of it were divinely committed to him. As respects God and the divine Trinity, he believed, in general, that the supreme Being, before the foundation of the world, produced in himself, and formed two *personal representations, economies, dispositions, dispensations, modes of existence*¹ (for he did not always use the same terms), namely, the *Word* and the *Holy Spirit*; by which he might both make known his will to mankind, and impart to them his blessings. That the *Word* was joined to the man *Christ*,

of Vienne came to Geneva, exhibiting a copy of the sentence passed upon Servetus, and requested that the prisoner might be delivered up to him, to be reconveyed to Vienne. Servetus was called before the court, and with tears entreated that he might not be delivered up, but that he might be tried at Geneva. To gratify his wishes, the court of Geneva refused to give him up, and proceeded in his trial. He denied the competence of a *civil* court to try a case of heresy; but his objection was overruled. He also appealed to the council of 200: but the appeal was not admitted. He attempted to accuse Calvin of heresy; but the court would not listen to his accusations. He objected, that Calvin reigned at Geneva, and begged to have his case tried by the other cantons. Accordingly the court ordered that Calvin should extract objectionable passages from Servetus's books, in his own words; that Servetus should subjoin such explanations and arguments as he thought fit; then Calvin to reply, and Servetus to answer; and the whole to be transmitted to Bern, Bâle, Zurich, and Schaffhausen, for the opinion of those cantons. This was accordingly done. The reply from all the cantons was, that the Genevans were in duty bound to restrain the madness and wickedness of Servetus, and prevent him from propagating his errors in future. But the manner in which this object should be accomplished was left to the discretion of the court of Geneva. The authorities of Bâle, however, intimated that a perpetual imprisonment might be sufficient. The court of Geneva now unanimously condemned Servetus to be burned alive the day following. Calvin and the other ministers of Geneva interceded for a milder death; but the court would not yield. Servetus was immediately informed of his sentence, and was greatly overcome. The next day, October 27, 1553, he appeared more composed. Farel attended him as a clergyman, and urged him to retract, which he pertinaciously refused. He was conducted to

the presence of the court, where his sentence was pronounced in form. He begged for a commutation of the mode of death; and Farel also urged the same; but the court would not listen. He was conducted slowly to the place of execution, permitted and even urged to address the people, which he refused. At length, he was fastened by a chain to a stake, seated on a block, and surrounded by combustibles. The fire was kindled, and he expired at the end of half an hour. To the last, he maintained the correctness of the opinions for which he suffered; and cried repeatedly, 'Jesus, thou Son of the eternal God, have mercy on me.'—At this day, all agree, that Servetus ought not to have been put to death: but in that age different sentiments prevailed. The burning of heretics was then almost universally approved and practised. There were some, however, especially among the French and Italian Protestants, whose exposure on this principle, to be themselves put to death by the papists, led them to question the correctness of this principle. Calvin, therefore, who certainly had some hand in the death of Servetus, was censured by a few protestants; while the great body of them, and even the mild Melancthon, fully approved his conduct. Some of the moderns have unjustly charged Calvin with being actuated solely by personal enmity against Servetus, and by the natural severity of his disposition. On the other hand, some have attempted entirely to exculpate him, and to attribute his conduct to the purest motives. He doubtless thought he was doing right, and had the approbation of his own conscience, as he certainly had of the wisest and best men of that age, who, as occasion was presented, pursued the same course themselves. But had he lived in our age, he would undoubtedly have thought and acted differently. *Tr.*]

¹ Personales representationes, œconomias, dispositiones, dispensationes, modos se habendi.

who was, by the all-powerful will of God, born to the virgin *Mary*: and that, on this account, *Christ* might justly be called God. That the *Holy Spirit* animates the created universe; and, in particular, produces in men holy and divine emotions and purposes. That after the destruction of this world, both these *Economies* will cease to be, and will be reabsorbed in God. Yet this doctrine he did not always state in the same manner, and he often uses slippery and ambiguous terms; so that it is exceedingly difficult to ascertain his real meaning. His moral principles agreed in most respects with the opinions of the *Anabaptists*: with whom also he agreed in this, that he most severely condemned the baptism of infants.

§ 6. That restituted church, of which he hoped himself to be the founder, died with *Servetus*. For, notwithstanding public fame ascribes to him many disciples, and not a few divines of our age pretend to have great apprehensions from the sect of *Servetus*, yet it may be justly doubted whether he left behind one genuine disciple. Those who are called *Servetians*, and followers of the doctrine of *Servetus*, by the writers of this age, differ widely from *Servetus* in many respects; and, in particular, they entertain very different opinions from his, respecting the doctrine of the divine Trinity. *Valentine Gentilis* of Naples, whom the government of Bern put to death in 1566, did not hold the opinions of *Servetus*, as many writers affirm; but held Arian sentiments, and made the Son and the Holy Spirit to be inferior to the Father.¹ Not much different were the views of *Matthew Gribaldus*, a jurist of Pavia; who was removed by a timely death, at Geneva, in 1566, when about to undergo a capital trial: for he distributed the divine nature into three *Eternal Spirits*, differing in rank as well as numerically.² It is not equally certain what was the criminal error of *Jo. Paul Alciat*, a Piedmontese, and of *Sylvester Tellius*, who were banished from Geneva in 1559, or of *Paruta*, *Leonardi*,³ and others, who are sometimes numbered among

¹ Peter Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, ii. 1251, article *Gentilis*. Jac. Spon's *Histoire de Genève*, l. iii. t. ii. p. 80, &c. Christ. Sand's *Bibliotheca Anti-Trinitar.* p. 26. Lamy's *Histoire du Socinianisme*, pt. ii. cap. vi. p. 251. Jo. Cour. Fuesslin's *Reformations-Beyträge*, v. 381, &c. [Gentilis fled his country, from religious motives, about the middle of the century; and settled at Geneva, in connexion with the Italian society there. Here, with others, he uttered anti-trinitarian sentiments; for which he was arraigned in 1558, subscribed to an orthodox confession of faith, and promised, under oath, not to leave the city without permission. He, however, fled clandestinely; and travelled in France, Switzerland, Germany, and Poland, propagating Arian sentiments. He was imprisoned at Lyons and at Bern, and was expelled from Poland. In 1566, he came to Bern a second time, was apprehended, and condemned to death, for having

obstinately, and contrary to his oath, assailed the doctrine of the Trinity. See Bayle, loc. cit. Aretius, a reformed divine, wrote *Historia Val. Gentilis 'justo capitis supplicio Bernæ affecti'*; 1617, fol. Tr.]

² Christ. Sand's *Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar.* p. 17. Lamy, loc. cit. pt. ii. cap. vii. p. 257, &c. Spon's *Histoire de Genève*, ii. 85, note. Haller, in the *Museum Tigurinum*, ii. 114.

³ On these, and other persons of this class, see Sand, Lamy, and Stanislaus Lubieniecus, *Historia Reformat. Polonica*, l. ii. c. v. p. 96. Concerning Alciat, in particular, see Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, i. 239. Also, Spon, loc. cit. ii. 85, 86. [This Alciat was a Milanese gentleman, and one of those Italians who fled their country, to join the protestants, and who afterwards so refined upon the mystery of the Trinity, as to form a new party, equally odious to protestants and catholics. Alciat had been a soldier; and he commenced his innovations at Geneva,

the followers of *Servetus*; yet it is not at all probable that any one of these regarded *Servetus* as his master. *Peter Gonesius*, who is said to have introduced the errors of *Servetus* into Poland,¹ although he may have taught some things akin to them, nevertheless explained the most sacred mystery of the divine Trinity in a very different manner from *Servetus*.

§ 7. No one of those hitherto named professed that form of religion which is commonly called *Socinian*. The Socinian writers, generally, trace the origin of their sect to Italy; and refer it to the year 1546. In this year, they tell us, within the Venetian territory, especially at Vicenza, more than forty men, eminent no less for genius and erudition than for their love of truth, often assembled together in secret; and they not only consulted on a general reformation in religion, but undertook more especially to refute the doctrines that were afterwards publicly rejected by the Socinian sect: they add that *Laelius Socinus*, *Alciatus*, *Ochin*, *Paruta*, *Gentilis*, and others, stood conspicuous among these persons: but by the imprudence of one of the associates, the temerity of these men became known; two of them were seized and put to death; the others escaped, and fled into Switzerland, Germany, Moravia, and other countries: among these exiles, *Socinus*, after various wanderings, passed into Poland in 1551, and again in 1558, and there disseminated the seeds of that scheme of doctrine which he and his associates had devised in their own country, which afterwards produced abundant fruits.² That this whole

in concert with a physician named Blandrata, and a lawyer named Gribaud (in Latin, Gribaldus), with whom became associated Valentine Gentilis. The precautions taken against them, and a severe procedure against Gentilis, intimidated the others, and induced them to seek another residence. They chose Poland, where Blandrata and Alciat disseminated their heresy with sufficient success. They allured Gentilis to come and join them. He was under obligation to Alciat, at whose entreaty the bailiff of Gex had let him out of prison. It is said, that from Poland they went to Moravia. Gentilis was beheaded at Bern, Alciat retired to Dantzic, and there died in the sentiments of Socinus. He wrote two letters to Gregory Paul, in 1564 and 1565, in which he maintains, that *Christ* had no existence till he was born of *Mary*. See Bayle, loc. cit. *Tr.*]

¹ This is affirmed by many, who here follow Wissowatius and Stan. Lubieniecius, *Historia Reformat. Polonice*: but how truly it is affirmed, may be learned from Lubieniecius, who says of Gonesius: 'He brought into his country the doctrine of *Servetus* concerning the pre-eminence of the Father, which he did not dissemble.' But if Gonesius taught the pre-eminence of the Father, he differed much from *Servetus*, who denied all real distinctions in the divine nature. As to the opinions of Gonesius, see Sand, l. c. p. 40, from whom chiefly Lamy borrows his account; *Histoire du Socinianisme*, t. ii. c. x. p. 278. [This Gonesius was of Podlachia; and studied in Saxony and Switzerland, where he got hold of the writings of *Servetus*. On his return home, he became intimate with some Anabaptists in Moravia: and in 1556, controverted the doctrine of the Trinity, first in a synod of the Polish Reformed, in which he pronounced it a fiction gendured in the human brain. Two years afterwards, he also rejected infant baptism. He likewise spoke contemptuously of civil authorities. See S. F. Lauterbach's *Polnisch. Arianischen Socinianismus*. *Schl.*]

² See Christopher Sand's *Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar.* p. 18, who likewise mentions (p. 25) some writings, which are said—but on altogether questionable authority—to have been published by those Venetian inventors of the Socinian system. Andrew Wissowatius, *Narratio, quomodo in Polonia Reformati ab Unitariis separati sunt*; subjoined to Sand, p. 209, 210. Stanisl. Lubieniecius, *Hist. Reformationis Polonice*, l. ii. c. i. p. 38, who says he derived this account from the Commentaries of Budzinius, never published, and from the life of *Laelius Socinus*. See also Sam. Przypciovius, *Vita Socini*; and others.

representation is a fiction cannot be maintained: yet it is easy to be shown, that the system of religion, which bears the name of *Socinus*, was by no means made up in those Venetian and Vicentine meetings.¹

¹ The late Gustavus George Zeltner, in his *Historia Crypto-Socinianismi Altorfini*, c. ii. § 41, note, p. 321, wished to have the truth of this story more accurately examined by the learned. Till this is done, we will here offer a few remarks, which will perhaps throw some light on the subject. In the thing itself, in my judgment, there is nothing incredible. It appears from many documents, that after the reformation commenced in Germany, many persons, in various countries subject to the Roman see, consulted together respecting the abolition of superstition: and it is the more probable that this was done by some learned men in the Venetian territory, as it is well known, that, in that age, there were living among the Venetians a considerable number of men who wished well, if not to Luther himself, yet to his design of reforming religion, and restoring it to its native simplicity. It is likewise easy to believe, that these consultations were interrupted by the vigilance of the satellites of Rome; and that some of those concerned in them were arrested and put to death; and that others saved themselves by flight. But it is very doubtful, nay, incredible, that all those persons were at these consultations, who are reported to have borne a part in them. Indeed, I am of opinion, that many of those who afterwards obtained celebrity by opposing the Christian doctrine of a Trinity in the Godhead, are rashly placed by incompetent judges in the list of members of such a Venetian association, because they have supposed, that this was the parent and the cradle of the whole Unitarian sect. This at least I certainly know, that Ochín must be excluded from it. For, not to mention that it is uncertain whether he has justly or unjustly been ranked among Socinians, it is clear from Zach. Boverius, *Annales Capucinatorum*, and from other unquestionable testimonies, that he left Italy, and removed to Geneva, as early as 1543. See *La Guerre Séraphique, ou l'Histoire des Périls, qu'a courus la Barbe des Capucins*, l. iii. p. 191, 216, &c. Respecting Lælius Socinus himself, who is represented as at the head of the association in question, I would confidently assert the same as of Ochín. For who can believe, that a young man only twenty-one years old (for such was Lælius at that time) left his native country, and repaired to the Venetian states, or Vicenza, to have a free discussion with others relative to the general interests of religion; and that this youth had such influence as to obtain the first rank in a numerous body of men distin-

guished for talent and learning? Besides, from the life of Lælius, and from other testimonies, it can be proved, that he retired from Italy, not to escape impending danger to his life, but for the sake of improvement, and acquiring a knowledge of the truth, among foreign nations. He certainly returned afterwards to his own country; and in 1551, resided some time at Siena, while his father resided at Bologna. See his letter to Bullinger, in the *Museum Helveticum*, v. 489, &c. Who can suppose the man would have undertaken such a journey, if but a few years previously, he had with difficulty escaped from the hands of the inquisitors and a capital punishment?

But, supposing all the rest to be true, which the Socinians tell us respecting the members and the character of this Venetian association, which had for its object the disrobing our Saviour of his divine Majesty, yet this we can never concede to them, that the Socinian system of doctrine was invented and drawn up in that association. It was unquestionably of later origin; and was long under the correcting and improving hand of many ingenious men, before it acquired its complete and permanent form. If any one wishes for proof of this, let him only look at the doctrines and reasonings of some of those, who are said to have been members of the association in question; which he will find to have been exceedingly diversified. It appears, from many facts, reported in various documents, concerning Lælius Socinus, that his mind had not yet become established in any definite system of religious doctrine, at the time he left Italy; and that he spent many years, subsequently to that period, in inquiring, doubting, examining, and discussing. And I could almost believe, that he finally died, still hesitating what to believe on various points. Gribaldus and Alciat, of whom notice has already been taken, were inclined to Arian views; and had not so low an opinion of our Saviour, as the Socinians had. These examples fully show, that those Italian reformers (if they really existed, which I here assume, but do not affirm) had come to no fixed conclusion; but were dispersed, and compelled to go into exile, before they had come to be of one opinion on points of the highest importance in religion.—This account of the origin of Socinianism, which many inconsiderately adopt, has also been objected to by Jo. Conr. Fuesslin, *Reformations-Beyträgen*, iii. 327, &c.

§ 8. We can give a more certain account of the origin and progress of Socinian principles in religion. As not only the Papists, but also the Lutherans and the Swiss, were everywhere watchful to prevent both *Anabaptists*, and adversaries to the glory of Jesus Christ and the triune God, from gaining anywhere a permanent habitation, a large number of this sort of people retired to Poland; supposing that a nation so strongly attached to liberty in general, would not disapprove of liberty in opinion respecting religious matters. Here they, at first, cautiously disclosed their views; being timid and doubtful what would be the issue. Hence, for a number of years, they lived intermixed with the Lutherans and Calvinists, who had acquired a firm establishment in Poland; nor were they excluded either from their communion in worship, or from their deliberative bodies. But after acquiring the friendship of the nobles and the opulent, they ventured to act more courageously, and to attack openly the common views of Christians. Hence originated, first, violent contests with the Swiss [or Reformed], with whom they were principally connected; the issue of which at last was, that in the Synod of Petrikow, A.D. 1565, they were required to secede, and to form themselves into a separate community.¹ These founders of the Socinian sect were commonly called *Pinczovians*, from the town² where the leaders of the sect resided. The greatest part of these, however, professed Arian sentiments respecting the divine nature; representing the Son and the Holy Spirit to be persons begotten by the one God, the Father, and inferior to him.³

§ 9. As soon as the *Unitarians* became separated from the other communities of Christians in Poland, they had to conflict with many difficulties, both internal and external. Without, they were oppressed, both by the Papists and by the Reformed and Lutherans: within,

¹ Lamy, *Histoire du Socinianisme*, pt. i. cap. vi. vii. viii. &c. p. 16, &c. Jo. Stoiensky (Stoinii), *Epitome Originis Unitariorum in Polonia*; in Sand, p. 183, &c. Geo. Schomann's *Testamentum*; *ibid.* p. 194. Andrew Wissowatius, *De Separatione Unitariorum a Reformatis*; *ibid.* p. 211, 212. Stanisl. Lubieniecicus, *Historia Reformat. Polonica*, l. ii. c. vi. &c. p. 111, &c. c. viii. p. 144. l. iii. c. i. p. 158, &c. [Among the Polish Antitrinitarians must also be reckoned, the Frenchman, Peter Satorius, who came to Poland in 1559, and was rector of the school at Pinczow. To the same party, Gregory Pauli, a Pole, afterwards joined himself. He had taught with great reputation in the Reformed church at Cracow, was deposed on account of his erroneous opinions, and then openly associated himself with the Unitarians. The Stancarian controversy contributed most to the discovery of the error of these people in regard to the Trinity. For many synods and conferences being held on that controversy, the Unitarians exposed themselves in them, and thus awakened the zeal of believers in the Trinity, to oppose them in the debates.

In 1564 and 1566 appeared the first royal edicts against the Unitarians; by which they were banished the realm. Valentine Gentilis, therefore, retired to Switzerland; and Jo. Paul Alciat, to Prussia. Others found concealed retreats with some of the nobles, till they could openly appear again in public. Under the same protection and patronage, they at length obtained churches, schools, and printing establishments of their own. *Schl.*

² [Pinczow. *Tr.*]

³ This will readily appear to one who shall attentively peruse the writers just quoted. It is indeed true, that all who bore the name of *Unitarian Brethren* did not hold precisely the same opinion respecting the divine nature. Some of the principal doctors among them were inclined towards those views of Jesus Christ, which afterwards were the common views of the Socinian sect: but the greater part of them agreed with the Arians, and affirmed that our Saviour was produced by God the Father, before the foundations of the world: but that he was greatly inferior to the Father.

there was danger, lest the feeble flock should become torn by factions. For they had not yet agreed upon any common formula of faith. Some continued still to adhere to Arian views, and were called *Farnovians*.¹ Others proceeded further, and preferred ascribing to Christ nothing scarcely besides the prerogatives of an ambassador of God. The worst of these were the *Budneians*; who maintained, that Christ was born just as all other men are; and, therefore, was unworthy of any divine worship or adoration.² Nor were they free from fanatical persons, who wished to introduce among them the practical notions of the Anabaptists; namely, a community of goods, a universal equality in rank and power, and other things of the like nature.³ From these troubles, however, they were happily soon relieved by the perseverance and authority of certain teachers; whose plans were so successful, that in a short time they reduced those factions to narrow limits, established flourishing churches at Cracow, Lublin, Pinczow, Lucklavitz, and especially at Smigla, a town which lay in the jurisdiction of the famous *Andrew Dudith*,⁴ and in many other places, both in Poland and in Lithuania; and, moreover, obtained licence to publish books in two different towns.⁵ These privileges were made complete by *John Sieniński*,⁶ waiwode of Podolia; who granted them a residence in his town of Racow, in the district of Sendomir, which he built in 1569.⁷ After obtaining this residence, the sect, now dis-

¹ [Concerning these, see below, § 22 of this chapter. *Tr.*]

² *Vita Andr. Wissowatii*; subjoined to Sand's *Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar.* p. 226, and Sand himself, on Simon Budneus, p. 54.

³ Lubieniec, *Historia Reformationis Polonicae*, lib. iii. cap. xii. p. 240.

⁴ See Mart. Adelt's *Historia Arianismi Smiglensis*, Dantzig, 1741, 8vo. [This Dudith, who was certainly one of the most learned and eminent men of the sixteenth century, was born at Buda, in 1533; and after having studied in the most famous universities, and travelled through almost all the countries of Europe, (visiting England, in 1554, in the suite of cardinal Pole,) 'was named to the bishopric of Tinia, by the emperor Ferdinand, and made privy counsellor to that prince. He had, by the force of his genius, and the study of the ancient orators, acquired such a masterly and irresistible eloquence, that in all public deliberations he carried everything before him. In the council' (of Trent), 'where he was sent, in the name of the emperor and of the Hungarian clergy, he spoke with such energy against several abuses of the church, of Rome, and particularly against the celibacy of the clergy, that the pope, being informed thereof by his legates, solicited the emperor to recall him. Ferdinand complied; but having heard Dudith's report of what passed in that famous council, he approved of his conduct, and rewarded him with the bishopric of Chonat.

He afterwards married a maid of honour of the queen of Hungary, and resigned his bishopric; the emperor, however, still continued his friend and protector. The papal excommunication was levelled at his head, but he treated it with contempt. Tired of the fopperies and superstitions of the church of Rome, he retired to Cracow, where he embraced the Protestant religion publicly, after having been for a good while its secret friend. It is said, that he showed some inclination towards the Socinian system. Some of his friends deny this; others confess it, but maintain that he afterwards changed his sentiments in that respect. He was well acquainted with several branches of philosophy and the mathematics, with the sciences of physic, history, theology, and the civil law. He was such an enthusiastic admirer of Cicero, that he copied over three times, with his own hand, the whole works of that immortal author. He had something majestic in his figure, and in the air of his countenance. His life was regular and virtuous, his manners elegant and easy, and his benevolence warm and extensive.' *Macl.* See Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch. seit der Reformat.* ii. 738, &c., and Rees' *Cyclopædia*, article *Dudith*. *Tr.*]

⁵ Sand's *Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar.* p. 201.

⁶ Sieniński.

⁷ Sand, loc. cit. p. 201. Lubieniec, loc. cit. p. 239, &c. [Here all the most famous Unitarians were established as teachers; here they set up, in 1602, a

persed far and wide among its enemies, trusting that it had obtained a fixed and permanent location for its religion, did not hesitate to make this place [Racow] the established centre of its church.

§ 10. The first care of the leaders of this church, after they saw their affairs in this settled state, was to translate the holy Scriptures into the Polish language; the publication of which took place in 1572. They previously had a Polish translation of the Bible, which they had made in 1565, conjointly with the Reformed, to whose church they then belonged. But this, after they were ordered to separate themselves from the Reformed, they considered not well suited to their condition.¹ In the next place, they drew up and published a small work, containing the principal articles of their religious faith. This was in the year 1574; when the first *Catechism* and *Confession* of the *Unitarians* was printed at Cracow.² The system of religion con-

school which they called *Athenæ Sarmaticæ*, in which the number of students often exceeded 1,000, and which was attended even by Catholics, because the mode of teaching was the same as that of the Jesuits, and no one was solicited to change his religion. Here also, they had, next to that at Lublin and one in Lithuania, their most famous printing establishment, first the Radeckish, and then the Sternackish, till 1638, from which so many works of the Unitarians were issued. *Schl.*]

¹ See Dav. Ringeltaube, *Von den Pöhl-nischen Bibeln*, p. 90, 113, 142, who gives a more full account of Polish translations of the Bible by Socinians.

² This little work, from which alone the character of the *Unitarian* theology, anterior to the times of Faustus Socinus, can be learned with certainty, is not mentioned, so far as I know, by any *Unitarian* author, nor by any one who has either written their history or opposed their doctrine. I am ready to believe that the Socinians themselves, afterwards, when they had acquired more dexterity and power, and had shaped their theology more artificially, wisely took care to have the copies of this confession destroyed; lest they should fall under the charge of fickleness, and of abandoning the tenets of their predecessors, or incur the charge of forsaking their ancient simplicity, which is apt to produce divisions and parties. It will therefore be doing service to the history of Christian doctrine, to describe here, summarily, the form and character of this first Socinian creed, which was set forth prior to the *Racovian Catechism*. This very rare book is quite a small one, and bears the following title: *Catechesis et Confessio Fidei Cætus per Poloniam congregati in nomine Jesu Christi Domini nostri crucifixi et resuscitati. Deuteronom. vi.: Audi, Israel, Dominus Deus noster Deus unus est. Johannis viii.: Dicit Jesus: Quem*

vos dicitis vestrum esse Deum, est Pater meus. Typis Alexandri Turobini, anno nati Jesu Christi, Filii Dei, 1574, pp. 160, 12mo. That it was printed at Cracow appears from the close of the preface, which is dated in this city, in the year 1574 *post Jesum Christum natum*. The Unitarians then had a printing-office at Cracow, which was soon after removed to Racow. The Alexander Turobinus, who is said to be the printer, is called Turobineczyk, by Christ. Sand (*Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar.* p. 51), and undoubtedly derived his name from his native place, Turobin, in the district of Chelm in Red Russia. That the author of the book was the noted George Schomann, has been proved from Schomann's *Testamentum*, published by Sand, and from other documents, by Jo. Adam Müller; who gives a particular account of Schomann, in his Essay, *De Unitariorum Catechesi et Confessione omnium prima*, written since my remarks on the subject; and which is printed in Bartholomew's *Fortgesetzten nützlichen Anmerkungen von allerhand Materien*, xxi. 758. The preface, composed in the name of the whole association, begins with the salutation: 'Omnibus salutem æternam sitientibus, gratiam et pacem ab uno illo altissimo Deo Patre, per unigenitum ejus Filium Dominum nostrum, Jesum Christum crucifixum, ex animo precatur cætus exiguus et afflictus per Poloniam, in nomine ejusdem Jesu Christi Nazareni baptizatus.' Their reasons for writing and publishing the book are thus stated; namely, the reproaches which, in one place and another, are cast upon the *Anabaptists*. Hence it appears that the people, who were afterwards called *Socinians*, were in that age denominated *Anabaptists*: nor did they reject, but tacitly admitted, this appellation. The remainder of the short preface consists of entreaties to the readers, to regard the whole as written in good faith, to read and judge for them-

tained in this book is extremely simple, and free from all subtleties: yet it exhibits the Socinian form, altogether, on the points most

selves, and, *forsaking the doctrine of Babylon, and the conduct and conversation of Sodom, to take refuge in the ark of Noah*; i.e. among the *Unitarians*. In the commencement of the book, the whole of the Christian religion is reduced to six heads: I. *of God and Jesus Christ*;—II. *of justification*;—III. *of discipline*;—IV. *of prayer*;—V. *of baptism*;—VI. *of the Lord's Supper*. And these six topics are then explained successively, by first giving a long and full answer or exposition of each; and then dividing them into subordinate questions or members, and subjoining answers with Scripture proofs annexed. It is manifest, even from this performance, that the infancy of the Socinian theology was very feeble and imbecile; that its teachers were not distinguished for a deep and accurate knowledge of divine things; and that they imbued their flocks with only a few and very simple precepts. In their description of God, which comes first in order, the authors at once let out their views concerning Jesus Christ; for they inculcate that, together with all creatures, he is *subject to God*. It is also noticeable, that they make no mention of God's infinity, his omniscience, his immensity, his eternity, his omnipotence, his omnipresence, his perfect simplicity, and the other attributes of the supreme Being, which are above human comprehension; but merely exalt God, for his wisdom, his immortality, his goodness, and his supreme dominion over all things. It would seem, therefore, that the leaders of the community even then believed that nothing is to be admitted in theology, which human reason cannot fully comprehend and understand. Their erroneous views of our Saviour are thus expressed: 'Our mediator with God is a man, who was anciently promised to the fathers by the prophets, and in these latter days was born of the seed of David, whom God the Father hath made Lord and Christ, that is, the most perfect prophet, the most holy priest, and the most invincible

king, by whom he created the new world,' (for those declarations of the sacred volume, which represent the whole material universe as created by our Saviour, they maintain, as the Socinians do, to be figurative; and understand them to refer to the restoration of mankind; so that they may not, unwillingly, be compelled to admit his divine power and glory,) 'restored all things, reconciled them to himself, made peace, and bestowed eternal life upon his elect; to the end that, next to the most high God, we should believe in him, adore him, pray to him, imitate him according to our ability, and find rest to our souls in him.'* Although they here call Jesus Christ *the most holy priest*, which they afterwards confirm with passages of Scripture, yet they nowhere explain the nature of that priesthood which they ascribe to him. The Holy Spirit they most explicitly declare not to be a divine *person*, and represent him as a divine power or energy: 'The Holy Spirit is the power of God, the fulness of which God the Father hath bestowed on his only-begotten Son, our Lord; that we being adopted might receive of his fulness.'† Their opinion of *justification* is thus expressed: 'Justification is the remission of all our past sins, for mere grace, through our Lord Jesus Christ, without our works and merits, in a lively faith; and the unhesitating expectation of eternal life; and a real, not a feigned amendment of life, by the aid of the Spirit of God, to the glory of God our Father, and the edification of our neighbours.'‡ As they make *justification* to consist in a great measure in a *reformation* of the life, so in the explanation of this general account, they introduce a part of their doctrine of morals; which is contained in a few precepts, and those expressed almost wholly in the words of the Scriptures. Their system of morality has these peculiarities, that it forbids *taking an oath*, and the *repelling of injuries*. They define *ecclesiastical discipline* thus: 'It is the fre-

* Est homo mediator noster apud Deum, patribus olim per prophetas promissus et ultimis tandem temporibus ex Davidis semine natus, quem Deus Pater fecit Dominum et Christum, hoc est, perfectissimum prophetam, sanctissimum sacerdotem, invictissimum regem, per quem novum mundum creavit, omnia restauravit, pacificavit, et vitam æternam electis suis donavit; ut in illum, post Deum altissimum, credamus, illum adoremus, invocemus, audiamus, pro modulo nostro imitemur, et in illo requiem animabus nostris inveniamus.

† Spiritus sanctus est virtus Dei, cujus plenitudinem dedit Deus Pater Filio suo unigenito, Domino nostro, ut nos adoptivi ex plenitudine ejus acciperemus.

‡ Justificatio est ex mera gratia, per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, sine operibus et meritis nostris, omnium præteritorum peccatorum nostrorum in viva fide remissio, vitæque æternæ indubitata expectatio, et auxilio Spiritus Dei vitæ nostræ non simulata, sed vera correctio, ad gloriam Dei Patris et ædificationem proximorum nostrorum.

essential to that system. Nor will this surprise us if we consider, that the papers of *Laelius Socinus* (which he undoubtedly left in Poland) were in the hands of a great many persons; and by these, the Arians, who had formerly had the upper hand, were led to change their opinion respecting *Jesus Christ*.¹ The name *Socinians* was not

quent reminding individuals of their duty; and the admonition of such as sin against God or their neighbour, first privately, and then also publicly before the whole assembly; and finally, the rejection of the pertinacious from the communion of saints, that so being ashamed they may repent, or, if they will not repent, may be damned eternally.* Their explanation of this point shows how incomplete and imperfect were their ideas on the subject. For they first treat of the government of the Christian church, and of the ministers of religion, whom they divide into *bishops*, *deacons*, *elders*, or *presbyters*, and *widows*: they next enumerate the duties of husbands and wives, the aged and the young, parents and children, servants and masters, citizens towards magistrates, the rich and the poor; and lastly, they treat of admonishing sinners first, and then depriving them of communion. Respecting *prayer*, their precepts are in general sound and good. But on the subject of *baptism*, they differ from other Christians in this, that they make it to consist in *immersion and emersion*, and allow it to be administered only to adults. 'Baptism,' say they, 'is the immersion in water, and the emersion, of a person who believes the gospel and exercises repentance, in the name of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit, or in the name of Jesus Christ; whereby he publicly professes, that by the grace of God the Father, he has been washed in the blood of Christ, by the aid of the Holy Spirit, from all his sins; so that, being ingrafted into the body of Christ, he may mortify the old Adam, and be transformed into the celestial Adam, in the firm assurance of eternal life after the resurrection.'† Lastly, concerning the *Lord's supper*, they give such a representation, as a Zwinglian would readily admit. At the end of the book, is added, *Œconomia Christiana, seu pastoratus domesticus*: that is, brief instructions, how the heads of

families should preserve and maintain piety and the fear of God in their houses; and containing also forms of prayers to be used morning and evening, and at other times. The copy of this *Catechism*, which I now possess, was presented by Martin Chelm (whom the Socinians name among the first patrons of their church) to M. Christopher Heiligmeier, in 1580; as appears from a long inscription at the end of the book. Chelm there promises his friend other writings of the same kind, if this should be received cheerfully and kindly: and concludes with these words of St. Paul: 'Infirma mundi elegit Deus, ut fortia confundat.'

¹ This we are clearly taught, by George Schomann, in his *Testamentum*, published by Sand, p. 194, 195. 'Sub id fere tempus (A.D. 1566) ex rhapsodiis Laëlii Socini quidam fratres didicerunt, Dei Filium non esse secundam Trinitatis personam Patri coessentialē et coæqualem, sed hominem Jesum Christum ex Spiritu Sancto conceptum, ex virgine Maria natum, crucifixum et resuscitatum: a quibus nos communiti, sacras literas perscrutari persuasi sumus.' These words most clearly show, that the Pinczovians (as they were called), before they separated from the Reformed in 1565, professed to believe in a *Trinity*, of some sort, and did not divest Jesus Christ of all divinity. For this Schomann was a doctor of great authority among them; and in 1565 (as he himself informs us), at the convention at Petricow, he contended (pro uno Deo Patre) for one God the Father, in opposition to the Reformed, who (he says) Deum trinum defendebant, maintained a *threefold God*. Yet in the following year, he, with others, was induced by the papers of Laelius Socinus to so alter his sentiments, that he denied Christ to be a *divine* person. He, therefore, with his Pinczovian flock, before this time, must necessarily have been, not a Socinian, but an Arian.

* *Disciplina ecclesiastica est officii singulorum frequens commemoratio, et peccantium contra Deum vel proximum primum privata, deinde etiam publica, coram toto cœtu, commonefactio, denique pertinacium a communione sanctorum alienatio, ut pudore suffusi convertantur, aut, si id nolint, æternum damnentur.*

† Baptismus est hominis Evangelio credentis, et pœnitentiam agentis, in nomine

Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti, vel in nomine Jesu Christi, in aquam immersio et emersio, qua publice profitetur, se gratia Dei Patris, in sanguine Christi, opera Spiritus sancti, ab omnibus peccatis ablutum esse, ut in corpus Christi insertus, mortificet veterem Adamum, et transformetur in Adamum illum cœlestem, certus, se post resurrectionem consequuturum esse vitam æternam.

yet known. Those who afterwards bore this name, were then usually called by the Poles *Anabaptists*; because they admitted none to baptism in their assemblies, but adults, and were accustomed to rebaptize such as came over to them from other communities.¹

§ 11. The affairs of the *Unitarians* assumed a new aspect, under the dexterity and industry of *Faustus Socinus*; a man of superior genius, of moderate learning, of a firm and resolute spirit, less erudite than his uncle *Laelius*, but more bold and courageous. When, after various wanderings, he went among the Polish *Unitarians*, in 1579, he at first experienced much trouble and opposition from very many, who accounted some of his opinions wide of the truth. And in reality, the religious system of *Faustus* (which he is said to have derived from the papers left by *Laelius*) had much less simplicity than that of the *Unitarians*. But the man, by his wealth, his eloquence, his abilities as a writer, the patronage of the great, the elegance of his manners, and other advantages which he possessed, overcame at length all difficulties; and by seasonably yielding at one time, and contesting at another, he brought the whole *Unitarian* people to acquiesce in those opinions of his, which they had before contemned, and, merging all disputes, to form themselves into one community.²

§ 12. Through his influence, therefore, the ill-digested, dubious, and unpolished religion of the old *Unitarians* became greatly altered, was more ingeniously stated, and more artfully and dexterously defended.³ Under the guidance of so spirited and respectable a leader, the body also, which before was a little feeble flock, rose in a short time to distinction and honour, by the accession to it of great numbers,

¹ This the *Unitarians* themselves attest, in the preface to their *Catechism*, as we have observed above: and it is confirmed by the author of the *Epistola de Vita Andr. Wissowatii*, subjoined to Sand's *Bibliotheca*. For he says (p. 226) that his sect bore the name of *Arians*, and of *Anabaptists*; but that the other Christians in Poland were all, promiscuously, called *Chrzescians*, from *Chrzest*, which denotes baptism.

² See Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, iv. 2741, artic. *Socinus*. Sand's *Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar.* p. 64. Sam. Przypocius, *Vita Socini*; prefixed to his works. Lamy, *Hist. du Socinianisme*, pt. i. c. xxiv. p. 101, &c. pt. ii. c. xxii. p. 375, &c. and many others.

³ It is, therefore, manifest, that the modern *Unitarians* are, with great propriety, called *Socinians*. For the glory of bringing their sect to establishment and order (if we may use the word *glory*, of what has little glory attached to it) belongs exclusively to the two *Socini*. *Laelius*, indeed, who was naturally timid, died in the bloom of life, at Zurich, in 1562, a professed member of the Reformed church; for he would not, by setting up a new sect, subvert his own tranquillity. And there are probable grounds for supposing, that he

had not brought to perfection that system of religion which he struck out; that he died in a state of uncertainty and doubt respecting many points of no small importance. Yet it was he who collected the materials which *Faustus* afterwards used: he secretly injected scruples into the minds of many: and, by the arguments against the divinity of our Saviour, which he committed to paper, he induced the *Arians* of Poland, even after he was dead, unhesitatingly to unite themselves with those who maintained Christ to be a man on a level with Adam, that is, one whom God created. What *Laelius* left unfinished, *Faustus*, beyond controversy, completed and put to use. Yet what part he received from his uncle, and what he added of his own (for he certainly added not a little), it is very difficult to ascertain; because only a few of the writings of *Laelius* are extant; and of those of which he is said to be the author, some ought, undoubtedly, to be attributed to others. This, however, we know, from the testimony of *Faustus* himself, that what he taught respecting the person of *Jesus Christ*, was for the most part excogitated by *Laelius*.

of all orders and classes, among whom were many persons of illustrious birth, of opulence, influence, eloquence, and learning. Of these, some helped forward the growing church by their wealth and influence, and others by their pens and their genius; and they boldly resisted the enemies whom the prosperity of the community everywhere called forth. The Unitarian religion, thus new-modelled, and made almost a new system, required a new *Confession* of faith to set forth its principles. Therefore, laying aside the old *Catechism*, which was but a rude and ill-digested work, *Socinus* himself drew up a new religious summary; which being corrected by some, and enlarged by others, resulted at last in that celebrated work, which is usually called the *Racovian Catechism*, and which is accounted the common standard of belief of the whole sect. The ship seemed now to have reached the port, when *James a Sienna*, lord of Racow, in the year 1600, renounced the Reformed religion, and came over to this sect, and, two years after, caused a famous school, intended for a seminary of the church, to be established in his own city, which he had rendered the metropolis of the Socinian community.¹

§ 13. In the year 1563, the doctrines of the Socinians were carried from Poland into the neighbouring Transylvania, by means especially of *George Blandrata*, whose exquisite skill in the medical art induced *John Sigismund*, at that time prince of Transylvania, to send for him, and make him his own physician. For this man, possessing intelligence and address, and being especially fitted for court affairs, together with *Francis Davides*, whom he took along with him, did not cease to urge the prince himself, and most of the leading men, until he had infected the whole province with his sentiments, and had procured for his adherents the liberty of publicly professing and teaching his doctrines. The *Bathoris*, indeed, who were afterwards created dukes of Transylvania by the suffrages of the nobles, were by no means favourable to Socinian principles; but they were utterly unable to suppress a sect so numerous and powerful.² Nor were the lords of Transylvania, who succeeded them, able to effect it. Hence to the present time, in this one province, the Socinians, by virtue of the

¹ See Wissowatius, *Narratio de Separatione Unitariorum a Reformatis*, p. 214. Lubieniecius, *Historia Reformat. Polonica*, l. iii. c. xii. p. 240, &c.

² See Sand's *Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar.* p. 28 and 55. Paul Debrezenius, *Hist. Ecclesiæ Reformatæ in Hungaria*, p. 147, &c. Martin Schmeizel, *de Statu Ecclesiæ Lutheranæ in Transylvania*, p. 55. Lamy, *Hist. du Socinianisme*, pt. i. cap. xiii. &c. p. 46, &c. Chr. Aug. Salig's *Hist. der Augsburg Confession*, vol. ii. book vi. ch. vii. p. 847, &c. [In 1568, the Unitarians held a disputation with the Trinitarians, at Weissenburg (in Transylvania), which continued ten days, and of which, George Blandrata, there, and in the same year, published his *Brevis Enarratio Disputa-*

tionis Albanæ: and Caspar Helt did the same, at Clausenburg, in the name of the Reformed. At the close of the debate, the Unitarians obtained from the nobles, who had been in the spot, all the privileges enjoyed by the Evangelical. They also got possession of the cathedral church of Clausenburg; filled the offices of instruction in the schools with Unitarians; and controlled all things according to their pleasure. Under Stephen Bathori, Francis David went so far as to oppose the offering of prayer to Christ. To reduce him, Blandrata called Faustus Socinus from Bâle, in 1578; and he so persecuted David, that he was condemned, in 1579, to perpetual imprisonment; in which he died. *Schl.*]

public laws and of certain compacts, enjoy their schools and houses of worship, and keep up their public meetings, though in the midst of continual snares.¹ About the same time, this sect attempted to occupy a portion of Hungary,² and of Austria.³ But the united efforts of the papists and the followers of a purer faith rendered these attempts abortive.

§ 14. The Socinians having obtained a stable domicile for their fortunes at Racow, and being sustained by patrons and friends of great authority and talent, began zealously to seek the enlargement of their church, and the propagation of their religion through all Europe. Hence, in the first place, they procured a large number of books to be composed by their brightest geniuses, some explaining and defending their religious principles, and others expounding, or rather perverting, the sacred Scriptures, according to the views of their sect; and these books they printed at Racow, and dispersed everywhere.⁴ In the next place, near the close of the century, as appears incontrovertibly from many documents, they sent their enissaries into various countries to make proselytes, and to establish new congregations. But these envoys, though some of them had the advantages of a noble birth, and others possessed extensive learning and acuteness in reasoning, were almost everywhere unsuccessful. A small company of Socinians existed in obscurity at Dantzic for a time; but it seems gradually to have disappeared with this century.⁵ In Holland, first *Erasmus Jansen*,⁶ and afterwards *Andrew Voidovius* and *Christopher Ostorodt*, great pillars of the sect, laboured to gain disciples and followers: nor were they wholly without success. But the vigilance of the theologians and of the magistrates prevented them from acquiring strength and establishing associations.⁷ Nor did Socinians find the Britons more accommodating. In Germany, *Adam Neuser* and some others, at the time when the prospects of the *Unitarians* were dark and dubious in Poland, entering into a confederacy with the Transylvanians, contaminated the Palatinate with the errors of this sect; but the mischievous design was seasonably detected, and frustrated. *Neuser* then retired among the Turks, and enlisted among the Janizaries at Constantinople.⁸

¹ Gustav. Geo. Zeltner's *Hist. Cryptosocinianismi Altorfini*, c. ii. p. 357, 359. [See also Walch's *Neueste Religionsgesch.* vol. v. no. 3. *Schl.*]

² Debrezenius, *Hist. Ecclesiæ Reform. in Hungaria*, p. 169, &c.

³ Hen. Spondanus, *Continuatio Ann. Baronii*, ad ann. 1568, no. xxiv. p. 704.

⁴ A considerable part of these books were edited in the collection, entitled *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum*, printed A.D. 1656. The collection, indeed, leaves out many of the productions of the first founders of the sect: yet it is quite sufficient to acquaint us with the genius and character of the sect.

⁵ Gustav. Geo. Zeltner's *Hist. Cryptosocinianismi Altorfini*, p. 199, note.

⁶ See Sand's *Biblioth.* p. 87.

⁷ Zeltner, loc. cit. p. 31 and 178. [Brandt, in his *History of the Reformation in the Netherlands*, tells us, that Ostorodt and Voidovius were banished, and that their books were condemned to be burnt publicly by the hands of the common hangman. Accordingly the pile was raised, the executioner approached, and the multitude was assembled, but the books did not appear. The magistrates, who were curious to peruse their contents, had quietly divided them among themselves and their friends.]

⁸ Burch. Gotth. Struve's *Pfälzische Kirchenhist.* ch. v. sec. 53, p. 214. Henr. Alting's *Hist. Eccles. Palatin.* in *Meig's Monumenta Palatina*, p. 266, &c. 337.

§ 15. Although the Socinians profess to believe that all knowledge of divine things must be derived from the sacred books of Christians, yet in reality they hold that the sense of the divine volume must be estimated and interpreted in conformity with the dictates of right reason; and therefore they subject religious truth, in a measure, to the empire of reason. For they intimate, sometimes tacitly, and sometimes expressly, that the inspired writers frequently slipped, through defects both of memory and of capacity; that they express the conceptions of their minds in language that is not sufficiently clear and explicit; that they obscure plain subjects by Asiatic phraseology, that is, by inflated and extravagant expressions; and therefore must be made intelligible by the aid of reason and sagacity. From such propositions, any person of but moderate capacity would readily infer that, in general, the history of the Jews and of our Saviour may be learned from the books of the Old and New Testaments; and that there is no reason to question the truth of this history generally; but that the doctrines which are set forth in these books must be so understood and explained, as not to appear contrary to the common apprehensions of men, or to human reason. The divinely-inspired books, therefore, do not declare what views we should have concerning God and his counsels; but human sagacity it is that points out to us what system of religion we are to search for in the Scriptures.

§ 16. This opinion becomes still worse when we consider what this sect understood by the term reason. For, by the splendid name of *right reason*, they appear to mean that measure of intelligence, or that power of comprehending and understanding things, which we derive from nature. And hence the fundamental maxim of the whole Socinian theology is this: Nothing must be admitted as a divine doctrine but what the human mind can fully *understand* and *comprehend*; and whatever the holy Scriptures teach, concerning the nature of God, his counsels and purposes, and the way of salvation, must be filed down and polished, by art and reason, till it shall agree with the capacities of our minds.¹ Whoever admits this, must also admit that there may be as many religions as there are people. For as one

Matur. Veyss la Croze, *Dissertationes Historiques*, i. 101, 127. Compare Bern. Raupach's *Presbyterologia Austriaca*, p. 113, &c. where he treats of John Matthæi, who was implicated in these commotions.

¹ [Dr. Ziegler, in his condensed View of the peculiar doctrines of Faustus Socinus (in Henke's *Neue Magazin für Religionsphilosophie*, &c. vol. iv. st. ii. p. 204, &c.), controverts this statement of Mosheim; and maintains, that Socinus aimed to base his doctrines wholly on the Scriptures, and not on reason as a higher authority. Schroeckh, in his *Church History since the Reformation* (vol. v. p. 560, &c.), replies to Ziegler; and while he admits that Socinus professed to regard the Bible as the source

of all religious truth, and nowhere expressly allows reason to have dominion over revelation, he yet maintains that Socinus, who was but a poor expositor, took great liberties with the Scriptures, and, in reality, *practised* upon the principle stated by Mosheim, though perhaps without much consciousness of it. And the subsequent Socinians, he says, proceeded further and further, till they at last discovered what was the fundamental principle of their theology; and since this discovery, they do not hesitate to avow it. Hence he concludes, that Mosheim is quite justifiable in making such a statement as he here gives. Tr.]

person is more obtuse than another, or more acute, so also what is plain and easy of comprehension to one, another will complain of as abstruse and hard to be understood. Neither do the Socinians appear to fear this consequence very greatly: for they allow their people to explain variously many doctrines of the greatest importance; provided they entertain no doubts respecting the general credibility of the history of Jesus Christ, and hold what the Scriptures inculcate in regard to morals and conduct.

§ 17. Proceeding on this maxim, the Socinians reject, or bring down to their comprehension, whatever presents any difficulty to the human mind in the doctrines of God, or of the Son of God, Jesus Christ, or of the nature of man, or in the entire plan of salvation, as proposed by the inspired writers, or in the doctrine of eternal rewards and punishments. God is indeed vastly more perfect than men are, yet he is not altogether unlike them: by that power with which he controls all nature he caused *Jesus Christ*, an extraordinary man, to be born of the virgin *Mary*: this man he caught up to heaven, imbued him with a portion of his own energy, which is called the Holy Spirit, and with a full knowledge of his will: and then sent him back to this world, that he might promulgate to mankind a new rule of life, more perfect than the old one, and might evince the truth of his doctrine by his life and his death. Those who obey the voice of this divine teacher (and all *can* obey it, if they are so disposed), being clad in other bodies, shall hereafter for ever inhabit the blessed abode where God resides: and those who do otherwise, being consumed by exquisite torments, shall at length sink into entire annihilation. These few propositions contain the whole system of Socinian theology, when divested of the decorations and subtle argumentations of their theologians.

§ 18. The general character of the Socinian theology requires them to limit their moral precepts entirely to external duties and conduct. For while they deny, on the one hand, that men's minds are purified by a divine influence; and on the other, that any man can so control himself as wholly to extinguish his evil propensities and passions; no course was left but to maintain that *he* is a holy man who lives agreeably to those precepts of the divine law which regulate the *words* and the *external actions*. Yet in stating and describing the duties of men, they were obliged to be uncommonly rigorous; because they maintained that the object for which God sent *Jesus Christ* into the world was to promulgate a most perfect law. And hence, very many of them hold it unlawful to resist injuries, to bear arms, to take oaths, to inflict capital punishments on malefactors, to oppose the tyranny of civil rulers, to acquire wealth by honest industry, and the like. And here also we unexpectedly meet with this singularity, that, while on other subjects they boldly offer the greatest violence to the language of the sacred writers, in order to obtain support for their doctrines, they require, that whatever is found in the Scriptures relating to life and to morals, should be understood and construed in the most simple and literal manner.

§ 19. The *Racovian Catechism*, which is generally regarded as the only creed of the sect, and an accurate portrait of their religion, contains only the popular system of doctrine, not that which their leaders and doctors hold marked out upon the mind.¹ A person, therefore, who wishes to know the grounds and the sources, from which the simple statements of the Catechism originated, must read and examine the works of their theologians. Besides, many doctrines and regulations of the Socinians, which might contribute to increase the odium under which the sect labours, and to lay open its internal character and state, are omitted in the Catechism. It appears, therefore, to have been written, rather for other people, to mitigate their indignation against the sect, than for the use of the Socinians themselves.² And hence, it never has obtained among them the authority of a public rule of faith; but their doctors have always been at full liberty, either to alter it, or to exchange it for another. By what rules the church is to be governed, and in what manner public religious worship is to be celebrated, their doctors have not taught us with sufficient clearness and uniformity. But in most things, they appear disposed to follow the customs of the *Protestants*.³

§ 20. Few are unapprised, that the first originators of the Socinian scheme possessed fine talents and much erudition. But when these were dead, or dispersed, the *Unitarians* of Poland seem to have had but little thirst for knowledge and intellectual cultivation; and not to have required their teachers to be men of acumen and well instructed in learning and literature. They adopted, however, other views, after they had obtained liberty to open schools at Racow and Lublin, and

¹ Jo. Andr. Schmid has treated expressly, on the authors and the history of this celebrated book, in his essay de *Catechesi Racoviensi*, published in 1707. Add Jo. Christ. Köcher's *Bibliotheca Theol. Symbol.* p. 656, &c. The very learned and veracious Geo. Lewis Oeder, not long since, published a new edition of it, with a solid confutation annexed; Francf. and Lips. 1739, 8vo. [There are properly two Racovian Catechisms, a larger and a smaller. The writer of the smaller was Valentine Smalcus, who drew it up in German, and first published it in 1605. It is entitled: *Der kleine Catechismus zur Uebung der Kinder in dem christlichen Gottesdienst in Rakow*, 1605. The larger was likewise published in German, by the same Smalcus, in 1608; but Hieron. Mascorovius translated it into Latin, in 1609, under the title: *Catechesis Ecclesiarum, quæ in regno Poloniæ, magno ducatu Lithuanie, et aliis ad istud regnum pertinentibus provinciis, affirmant neminem alium, præter Patrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi, esse illum verum Deum Israelis*, &c. Afterwards John Crell and Jo. Schlichting revised and amended it; and after their death, Andr. Wissowatius, and Stegmann the younger, published it in 1665. In

1680, it was subjoined to Crell's *Ethica Aristotelica*, as an Appendix; in order to procure it a wider circulation. All these editions were in 4to. In 1684, there was an edition in 8vo, still more complete, as it contained the notes of Martin Ruarus, Benedict Wissowatius the younger, and of one not named. *Schl.*]

² This may be inferred from the fact that they presented a Latin copy of it to James I., king of Great Britain, but a German copy to the university of Wittemberg. [To show their gratitude, the theologians of Wittemberg allowed a feeble confutation of it to be drawn up by Frederic Baldwin, which was first published in 1619; and James I. condemned the book to the flames. *Schl.*]

³ This appears from Peter Morscovius or Morskowsky's *Politia Ecclesiastica, quam vulgo Agenda vocant, sive forma regiminis exterioris Ecclesiarum Christianarum in Polonia, quæ unum Deum Patrem, per Filium ejus unigenitum in Spiritu sancto confitentur*; in 3 books, composed in 1642, and published by Oeder, a few years since, at Nuremberg, 4to. This book is mentioned by Christ. Sand, *Biblioth. Antitrinitar.* p. 142; who says, it was written for the use of the *Belgic churches*.

had discovered that their cause could not possibly be upheld, without defenders and vindicators in no respect inferior to their adversaries. Their love of learning became more ardent, from the time when *Faustus Socinus* undertook to sustain and to regulate their tottering and ill-arranged church: and not a few persons, noble by intellect as well as birth, appeared among them. For they were disposed to have the study of eloquence pursued, the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin literature taught to the young, and philosophy expounded to a few geniuses. The Racovians, according to the custom of the age, made *Aristotle* their guide in philosophy; as appears from John Crell's *Ethica*, and from other monuments of those times.

§ 21. At the same time, the leaders of the sect declare, in numberless places of their books, that, both in the interpretation of the Scriptures, and in explaining and demonstrating the truths of religion in general, clearness and simplicity are alone to be consulted, and that no regard should be paid to the subtleties of philosophy and logic: which rule, if the interpreters and doctors in the highest esteem among them, had considered as laid down for *themselves*, they would have given much less trouble to their enemies. For in most of their books, exquisite subtlety and art are found, combined with an indescribable amount of either real or fictitious simplicity. They are most acute, and seem to be all intellect, when discussing those subjects, which other Christians consider as lying beyond man's power of comprehension, and, therefore, as simply to be believed. On the contrary, all their sagacity and powers of reason forsake them, just where the wisest of men have maintained, that free scope should be given to reason and human ingenuity. Although this may appear contradictory, yet it all flows from that one maxim of the whole school, that whatever surpasses the comprehension of the human mind, must be banished from Christian theology.

§ 22. The *Unitarians*, as soon as they were separated from the society of the Reformed in Poland, became divided into parties; as has been already mentioned. The subjects of dispute among them, were, the dignity of Jesus Christ; a Christian life and behaviour; whether infants are proper subjects of Christian baptism; whether the Holy Spirit is a *person*, or a *divine attribute*; and some other subjects. Among these parties, two continued longer than the others, and showed themselves less docile and manageable to the pacificators; namely, the *Budnæan* and *Farnovian* sects. The former had for its founder and leader, *Simon Budnæus*, a man of acuteness, who, seeing more clearly than others whither the principles of *Laelius Socinus* would lead, maintained that *Jesus Christ* was not to be honoured with our prayers, nor with any other kind of worship; and in order more easily to support this error, he declared, that Christ was conceived not by virtue of any divine power, but in the way that all other men are. These tenets, indeed, harmonise very well with the first principles of the Socinian scheme; but they appeared to most persons intolerable and execrable. *Budnæus*, therefore, who had many disciples in Lithuania and Russian Poland, was deposed from his ministerial office

in 1584; and, with his adherents, was excommunicated. But he is said to have afterwards given up his opinion, and to have been restored to the communion of the sect.¹

§ 23. Into nearly the same error which had proved disastrous to *Budneus*, a little while after, fell *Francis Davides*, an Hungarian, and superintendent of the Socinian churches in Transylvania; for he resolutely denied, that prayer or any religious worship should be offered to *Jesus Christ*. After *Blandrata* and *Faustus Socinus* himself, who had been sent for into Transylvania for this very object, in 1573, had in vain employed all the resources of their ingenuity in efforts to reclaim *Davides*, the prince of Transylvania, *Christopher Bathori*, threw him into prison; where he died at an advanced age, A.D. 1579.² Yet his sad fate did not end the controversy which he had commenced. For *Davides* left behind him disciples and friends, who long contended strenuously for the tenets of their master, and who gave no little trouble to *Socinus*, and to his followers in Poland and Lithuania. Among them the following were most distinguished, *James Palæologus* of Chios, who was burnt at Rome in 1585; *Christian Francken*, who held a dispute with *Socinus* himself; *John Sommer*, rector of the school at Clausenburg;³ and some others. Moreover, this sect was usually called, by the Socinian writers, the sect of *Semi-Judaizers*.⁴

¹ See Christoph. Sand's *Biblioth. Antitrinitar.* p. 54, 55. *Epistola de Vita Wissowatii*, ibid. p. 226. Ringeltaube von den *Pöhlischen Bibeln*, p. 144, 152, &c. Moreover, Samuel Crell, the most learned Socinian of our age (in the *Thesaurus Epistolar. Crozianus*, i. 111), is of opinion (how justly, I cannot say), that Adam Neuser, a German, was the author of this degrading opinion of Christ.

² Sand, l. c. p. 55, 56. *Faustus Socinus*, *Opp. omnia*, i. 353, 395, ii. 713, 771, where is given his dispute with Francis Davides. Stan. Lubieniecius, *Hist. Reformat. Polonicæ*, l. iii. c. xi. p. 228.

³ See, respecting these persons, Sand's *Biblioth.* p. 57, 58, 86. The dispute of Socinus with Francken, on this subject, is in Socinus's Works, ii. 767. [Palæologus was actually of the race of the Greek emperors, who bore this name. At Rome he fell into the hands of the inquisition; but he escaped by flight. In Germany he held himself for a protestant, and in Poland for a Socinian. They made him their rector at Clausenburg. But as he journeyed through Moravia, he was seized by order of the emperor Maximilian, and transmitted to Rome.—Francken was of Gardzlegen, and born a Lutheran. But he turned catholic,

and entered the order of Jesuits. Afterwards he revolted to the Unitarians; and was made rector, first of Chmielnizk in Poland, and then of Clausenburg. As the Turkish war obliged him to go to Prague, he again turned catholic. His writings are mentioned by Sand, l. c. — Sommer was a native of Pirna in Meissen; and went to Transylvania, at the instigation of Blandrata. *Schl.*]

⁴ *Faustus Socinus* wrote a book, expressly *contra Semi-Judaizantes*; which is in his *Opp.* ii. 804. Socinus and his friends did not expend so much effort and care in the suppression of this faction because they thought it very pernicious and hostile to the Christian religion. On the contrary, Socinus himself concedes, that the point in debate was of no great consequence, when he declares, that it is not necessary to salvation, that a person should pray to *Christ*. In his answer to Wujeck (*Opp.* ii. 538, &c.), he says: 'But if any one is possessed of so great faith, that he dare always go directly to God himself, and does not need the consolation which arises from the invocation of Christ his brother tempted in all things; such a one is not obliged to pray to Christ.* According to his judgment, therefore, those have a higher degree of faith,

* Quod si quis tanta est fide præditus, ut ad Deum ipsum perpetuo recte accedere audeat, nec consolatione, quæ ex Christi

fratris sui per omnia tentati invocatione proficiscitur, indigat, hic non opus habet, ut Christum invocet.

§ 24. Towards the *Farnovians*, the Socinians were much more indulgent; for they were not excommunicated, nor required to abandon the opinions which they held, but only to conceal them, and not advance them in their sermons.¹ The head of this party was *Stanislaus Farnovius* or *Farnesius*; who was induced by *Peter Gonesius* to think the Arian hypothesis better than the Socinian; and who maintained, that, before the foundation of the world, *Christ* was either begotten, or produced out of nothing by the supreme God. What he thought of the Holy Spirit is less clear: but it is known, that he forbade his followers to pray to the Holy Spirit.² When *Farnovius* separated himself from the other *Unitarians*, in 1568, he had many adherents, who were distinguished both for influence and learning; among others, *Martin Czechovicus*, *John Niemoiovius*, *Stanislaus Wisnowius*, *John Falconius*, and *George Schomann*. But a part of these were overcome by the gentle treatment and the dexterous reasoning of the Socinians; and others were afterwards discouraged and disheartened by the discreet management of *Faustus Socinus*. At last the party, being bereft of its leader, *Farnovius*, who died in the year 1615, became dispersed and extinct.³

who, neglecting Christ, pray only to God himself. Why, then, so severely avenge the crime of *Davides*, who wished to lead all Christians directly to the Father? *Lubieniecius* also, in his *Hist. Reform. Polonica*, l. iii. c. xi. p. 228, not obscurely detracts, very much, from the importance of this controversy, when he writes, that in Transylvania (*there were billows raised in a tea-cup*.) ‘*fluctus in simpulo excitatos esse*.’ From which it appears manifest, that the Socinians made war upon *Davides* and his adherents, perhaps solely for this reason, lest, by tolerating his opinion, they should inflame the enmity of other Christians against themselves, which they already felt to be sufficiently great; while they deemed the opinion, in itself considered, to

be one that might be tolerated.

¹ *Epistola de Vita Wissowatii*, p. 226. According to the testimony of Sand (*Biblioth. Anti-Trinitar.* p. 87), Erasmus Johannis was admitted to the office of teacher in the Socinian congregation at Clausenburg, on the condition, that in his sermons he should advance nothing to show that Jesus Christ existed before Mary.

² Sand’s *Biblioth.* p. 52, and in various passages, under the names we have mentioned.

³ We omit here the names of the more distinguished Socinian writers of this century, because a large part of them have been already noticed in the preceding history. The rest may be easily collected from Sand’s *Bibliotheca*.

SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

SECTION I.

THE GENERAL HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

§ 1. The Roman congregation for propagating the faith—§ 2. Urban VIII. The college for propagating the faith—§ 3. French congregations of this kind—§ 4. Hence many missionaries; among whom, the Jesuits are distinguished—§ 5. Yet the Jesuits became suspected—§ 6. The plans of the Jesuits cause contention—§ 7. Propagation of Christianity in India—§ 8. The kingdoms of Siam, Tonquin, &c.—§ 9. China—§ 10. Progress there—§ 11. The Jesuits accused—§ 12. The principal accusation. History of it—§ 13. Chinese controversy. The first question—§ 14. The second question—§ 15. Christianity in Japan—§ 16. Destroyed and overthrown—§ 17. Protestant missions in Asia—§ 18. In Africa—§ 19, 20. In America—§ 21. The enemies of Christianity in England—§ 22. Hobbes, the earl of Rochester, &c.—§ 23. Vanini, Rugger, Leszynski, Knutzen—§ 24. Benedict de Spinoza—§ 25. Literature and science cultivated and improved—§ 26. Mathematical science especially—§ 27. History—§ 28. Languages and eloquence studied—§ 29. The law of nature—§ 30. Aristotelian and Paracelsic philosophy—§ 31. Peter Gassendi—§ 32. The Cartesian philosophy—§ 33. Its principal adversary, Gassendi—§ 34. Two sects of philosophers, the mathematical and metaphysical—§ 35. Propagation and improvement of the metaphysical philosophy—§ 36. Progress of the mathematical philosophy—§ 37. Philosophers, who were not of these schools.

§ 1. THE arduous efforts commenced by the Roman pontiffs in the preceding century for extending the Christian church, and thus exalting and enlarging the glory and majesty of the Roman see, were in this century placed upon a permanent and solid basis: whereas, before, they had been tottering and ill-supported. In the first place Gregory XV., at the instigation of his chaplain, Narni, established at Rome, in 1622, the famous *Congregation for propagating the faith*,¹ and furnished it with very extensive revenues. This body, which consists of thirteen cardinals, two priests, and one monk, together with a scribe,² has for its object the support and the propagation of the Romish religion in all parts of the world. Urban VIII.,

¹ Congregatio de propaganda Fide.

² Such is the number of members in this body, as stated by Gregory XV. in his bull for its establishment: *Bullarium Romanum*, iii. 472, ed. Luxemb. Nor is a larger number mentioned by Urban Cerri; *État présent de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 259. But Ja.

Aymon, in his *Tableau de la Cour de Rome*, pt. iii. cap. iii. p. 279, makes it to consist of eighteen cardinals, one papal secretary, one apostolical prothonotary, one referent, or referendary, and one of the assessors and scribes of [the *Inquisition*, or] what is called the *Sacred Office*.

and after him numerous wealthy individuals, enriched it with so great revenues, that it is equal to the bearing of almost unlimited expenses. Hence, it sends out numerous missionaries to the most remote nations; publishes books of various kinds, necessary for learning foreign and some of them barbarous languages; causes instructions in Christianity, and other works designed to enkindle piety or confute error, to be drawn up in the languages and appropriate characters of the several nations; maintains and educates a vast number of selected youth, designed for missionaries; liberally educates and supports young men, who are annually sent to Rome from foreign countries, in order to become instructors of their countrymen on their return home; receives and maintains persons whose constancy in professing and defending the Romish religion has drawn on them banishment or other calamities; and plans and accomplishes various objects, almost beyond belief to those not acquainted with such affairs. For the carrying of these objects into effect, a very splendid and spacious palace has been set apart, which is situated so delightfully, that it captivates by that circumstance alone.¹

§ 2. To this institution *Urban VIII.*, in the year 1627, added another, not indeed equally magnificent, yet renowned, and very useful; namely, the *College or Seminary for propagating the faith*; in which, from almost all nations, future heralds of Christian truth to foreign countries are educated, and imbued most carefully with such learning and instruction as form a necessary preparation for an office so important. This great institution originated in the zeal of *John Baptist Viles*, a Spaniard residing at the Roman court, who set it on foot by presenting to the pontiff all his possessions and property, including an elegant house that he owned. Many others afterwards imitated his liberality, and to this day imitate it. *Urban* at first placed this College under the care and authority of three *Canons* of the three *patriarchal* churches at Rome: but since the year 1641, it has been under the control of the *Congregation*, already mentioned as established by *Gregory XV.*²

¹ The authors who treat of this congregation, are enumerated by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Lux Evangelii toti orbi exoriens*, c. xxxiii. p. 566. To whom may be added, Dorotheus Ascianus, *De Montibus Pietatis Ecclesiæ Romanæ*, p. 522, &c. where there is a list of the books published by the congregation, up to the year 1667. [The annual revenue of this congregation, near the close of this century, was about 24,000 Roman dollars. Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation*, iii. 715. Tr.]

² Hippol. Helyot, *Hist. des Ordres Monastiques Religieux et Militaires*, t. viii. cap. xii. p. 78, &c. Urban Cerri, *Etat présent de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 293, &c. where, however, the first founder is erroneously called Vives. [It is not certain, that Viles, rather than Vives, was the true name of the founder.—He established ten scholarships, for youth from foreign lands. Car-

dinal Barberini, the pope's brother, in 1537 and 1538, added *thirty-one* more scholarships; for Georgians, Persians, Nestorians, Jacobites, Melchites, Copts, Abyssinians, and Indians; and in defect of these, for Armenians, from Poland, Russia, and Constantinople. The scholars on Barberini's foundation were to bind themselves to become missionaries among their own countrymen, or to go wherever the Congregation *de Propaganda* should order them.—Urban Cerri was secretary to the Congregation *de Propaganda*, and drew up an account of the Present State of the Roman church in all parts of the world, for the use of Innocent XI.; which fell into the hands of the Protestants, and was translated and published, English and French, in 1716. Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch. seit der Reform.* iii. 715, &c. Tr.]

§ 3. In 1663 the *Congregation of priests for foreign missions* was instituted by the royal authority in France; and likewise the *Parisian Seminary for missions to foreign nations* was founded by certain French bishops and theologians, in which men might be educated and instructed, in order to become preachers of Christianity among the nations estranged from Christ. From this *Seminary* go forth, even to the present day, the *apostolic vicars* of Siam, Tonquin, Cochin China, the bishops of Babylon, and the apostolic vicars of Persia, and other missionaries to the Asiatic nations; and they derive their support from the ample revenues of the *Congregation* and the *Seminary*.¹ But the *Priests for foreign missions*,² and their pupils, generally have much contention and controversy with the Jesuits and their missionaries. For they are displeased with the method pursued by the Jesuits for the conversion of the Chinese and others; and moreover, the Jesuits will not submit to the commands of the *apostolic vicars* and *bishops*, appointed by the *Congregation*, agreeably to the pontifical ordinance; nor to the Roman *College for propagating the faith*. Likewise the French *Congregation of the holy sacrament*, instituted by *Authier*, bishop of Bethlehem,³ was required by *Urban VIII.*, in the year 1644, to always have fit men in readiness to be sent to the nations ignorant of Christianity, whenever the pontiff, or the *Congregation for propagating the faith*, should demand their services.⁴ Other bodies of less note, which have been established in various countries, for the purpose of enlarging the church, and the pains taken by the Jesuits and the other orders to provide a supply of missionaries, I shall leave to others to enumerate and describe.

§ 4. From these colleges and societies issued those swarms of missionaries who travelled over the whole world, so far as it is yet discovered, and from among the most ferocious nations gathered congregations that were, if not in reality, yet in name and in some of their usages, Christian. Among these missionaries, the *Jesuits*, the *Dominicans*, the *Franciscans*, and the *Capuchins*, obtained the greatest glory. Yet they mutually assail and accuse each other publicly of disregarding and dishonouring the cause of Christ, and even of corrupting his holy doctrines. The *Jesuits*, in particular, are the most spoken against, both by the others who labour with them in the glorious cause of enlarging the Saviour's empire, and by the great body of their own church. For it is said, that they instil into most of their proselytes, not the pure religion which Christ taught, but a lax and corrupt system of faith and practice; that they not only tolerate, and wink at, practices and opinions that are superstitious and profane, but even encourage them among their followers; that they amass vast riches by traffic, and by other unbecoming arts

¹ See, particularly, the *Gallia Christiana Benedictinor.* vii. 1024, &c. Helyot, *Hist. des Ordres*, t. viii. c. xii. p. 84, &c.

² They are generally called, by the French, *Messieurs des Missions étrangères*.

³ [This was a titular dignity, or a see *in partibus*, that is, *infidelium*, as Romanists say. S.]

⁴ Helyot, *l. c.* c. xiii. p. 87, 100.

and occupations; that they are eager after worldly honours, and court the favour of the great by adulation and presents; that they involve themselves needlessly in civil affairs and in the intrigues of courts; that they frequently excite seditions and civil wars in nations; and finally, that they will not obey the Roman pontiff, and the vicars and bishops whom he sends out. If any one call for witnesses to support these heavy charges, he finds himself almost overwhelmed with their multitude and their splendour. For there are produced illustrious and very grave men from every Romish country; and among them are many, on whom can fall no suspicion of envy, credulity, or ignorance; such as cardinals, members of the Congregation for propagating the faith, and what cannot be surpassed, some of the pontiffs themselves. Nor do these witnesses come forward unarmed for the contest, but assail the doubting with the very facts perpetrated by the Jesuits, particularly in China, Abyssinia, and Japan, to the great injury of the Romish cause.¹

§ 5. The Jesuits, although they exerted all their sagacity and cunning (for which they are said to be pre-eminent), in order to silence these accusations, yet could not prevent them from reaching Roman ears. Among many circumstances which go to prove this, may be mentioned especially the following, that the association at Rome, which controls absolutely all sacred missions, has now, for many years, employed the Jesuits more sparingly and more cautiously than formerly; and that on great and trying occasions, it sets a higher value on the sobriety, poverty, and patience of even the *Capuchins* and *Carmelites*, than on the abundant resources, the ingenuity, and the courage of the Jesuits. Yet neither this body, nor even the pontiffs, are able to correct all that they either tacitly or openly censure in the Jesuits; but are obliged, however much against their wishes, to tolerate a great number of things. For the disciples of *St. Ignatius* have acquired, in various ways, so great influence, and so much wealth, throughout the Romish world, that they dare menace even the monarch of the church; nor can they be compelled, without hazard, to obey his injunctions, whenever they refuse to do so. This most powerful society either dictates itself the decrees of the Roman court; or if dictated by others, it either refuses with impunity to obey them, or by its ingenuity gives them such an interpretation as the interests of the Ignatian fraternity demand.

§ 6. The cause of this great dissension between the Jesuits and the other Christian missionaries is, that the Jesuits pursue a very different method in converting nations to Christianity from that of their colleagues and associates. The Jesuits are of opinion, that people deeply sunk in superstition should be approached with art and policy; and that they are to be led, by a cautious and careful hand, to embrace the Gospel. Hence they explain and interpret the received doctrines and opinions of the pagans—as, for instance, the

¹ A great amount of testimony is collected by the author of the *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus*, Utrecht, 1741, 8vo, throughout the Preface.

precepts of *Confucius* in China—in such a manner, that they may seem to differ as little as possible from the doctrines of Christianity; and if they find anything in their religion or their history analogous at all to the faith and the history of Christians, they carefully apply it to demonstrate the harmony between the old religion and the new. The rights and usages, also, which the nations received from their progenitors, unless they are totally opposite to the Christian rites, they tolerate, and either changing their form a little, or referring them to a better end than before, accommodate them to Christianity. The natural biasses and propensities of the people they comply with, so far as it is possible, and carefully avoid whatever is opposed to them. The priests and men of learning, by whom the populace are generally led, they labour in all possible ways, and even by pious frauds, to secure and bring over to their party. They court the favour and the friendship of those in power, by presents, by the cultivation of various arts, mathematics, medicine, painting, and the like, as well as by affording them counsel and aid in their difficulties. I might specify many other particulars. Now all these their colleagues and associates look upon as artifices and tricks unworthy of ambassadors of Christ, who, they think, should plead the cause of God openly and ingenuously, without deception and cunning. Hence they attack superstition, and everything that grows out of or tends towards it, openly and avowedly; do not spare the ancestors or the ancient ceremonies of the pagans; pay no attention to their chiefs, their courts, their priests; state the mysteries of Christianity nakedly, and do not hesitate to oppose the hereditary religions of the nations.

§ 7. The name and the religion of Christians were sounded over nearly all Asia, in this century, by these ministers of the Roman see. We begin with *India*; nearly all the parts of which, and especially those formerly subject to the Portuguese till they were driven out by the Dutch, received some sparks of the heavenly light, though involved in much obscurity, by the labours of the Jesuits, and also of some Theatins and Augustinians. But of all the missions ever undertaken to these nations, none has been more noticed and talked of than that to *Madura*: and none is said to have produced more abundant fruits, quite to the present times. *Robert de Nobili*, or as some write it, *de Nobilibus*, an Italian Jesuit, who commenced this mission, reflecting that the Indians abhor all Europeans, and on the other hand venerate exclusively the race of Brahmans, as if descended from the gods, and that they will listen to no other teachers, feigned himself a Brahman, come from a distant country; and by staining his face, and adopting that very austere and painful mode of life which the *Sanianes* or penitents lead, he persuaded the credulous people to believe him. By this artifice he first brought over twelve Brahmans to adopt his discipline: and their example induced a great multitude to follow him as their master. After the death of *Robert*, this singular establishment lay for some time neglected.¹ But after-

wards, by the counsels and exertions of the Portuguese Jesuits, it was revived; and it is continued at the present time by such Jesuits, both French and Portuguese, as think themselves able to submit to its very severe rules. These fictitious Brahmans, who deny themselves to be Europeans or *Franks* (*Pranghis*, as the Indians pronounce it), and pretend to have been born in the northern regions, are said to be at the head of a community almost numberless, and one which is annually increasing by large accessions; nor is this very incredible.¹

¹ The Jesuits can scarcely find words adequate, when they would either extol the glory and the effects of this mission, or describe the sufferings and labours voluntarily endured by the missionaries. See the *Lettres curieuses et édifiantes écrites des Missions étrangères*, i. 9, 32, 46, 50, 55. Father Martin there (p. 9) pronounces it *the most beautiful and most perfect mission that ever was*; 'la plus belle qui soit au monde.' Each of the missionaries is said to have baptized at least a thousand persons annually (p. 11): 'Le moins que chaque missionnaire en baptise par an, est mille.' Yet, if credit is to be given to him (p. 12), access to the sacred font was not unadvisedly allowed of. Persons were long under trial, and were instructed for four months, in order to their being received; and those received, so live that they appear more like heavenly angels, than like men; 'ils vivent comme des anges.' And very rarely do there occur among them any instances of such sins as merit eternal death. If the causes of this extraordinary sanctity are demanded, the Jesuits mention two. The first is, the lives of the missionaries, than which nothing could be more austere and more repugnant to human nature (p. 15); 'la vie des missionnaires ne sauroit être plus austère ni plus affreuse selon la nature.' See also xii. 206, xv. 211, &c. They neither allow themselves the use of bread, nor wine, nor flesh, nor fish, but live upon water and pulse, of the most insipid kinds, and without condiments. Their dress and other things correspond to their diet. The other reason assigned is, that these new Christians live entirely separated from Europeans; who are said (p. 16, 17) by their licentiousness and corrupt morals, to contaminate all Christian converts from among the Indians. See also what is said in various places in these Letters, concerning the mission to Madura; e.g. t. ii. p. 1, &c. iii. 217, v. 2, vi. 119, &c. ix. 126, and elsewhere.—*Madura* is a kingdom situated in the heart of the peninsula of India, this side the Ganges. An accurate geographical map of all the countries embraced in the mission to Madura, was published by the Jesuits, in the *Lettres curieuses et édifiantes des Missions*, xv. 60, &c. The

French Jesuits established a mission, after the model of this, in the Indian kingdom of the *Carnatic*, and its vicinity. See *Lettres édifiantes*, v. 3, 240. Near the end of the century, other Jesuits projected a similar mission in the territories of the king of *Maravia* [or *Marawas*]. See *Lettres édifiantes*, ii. 1, x. 79. But the Jesuits themselves admit (*Lettres édif.* vi. 3, 15, 66, 107, &c.), that their mission was more successful in the kingdom of *Maravia*, than in that of the *Carnatic*. Perhaps the French Jesuits, who founded the *Carnatic* mission, were unable so perfectly and patiently to follow that severe and painful mode of living, which this plan required, as the Portuguese and Spanish Jesuits were. Recently, Benedict XIV., who does not approve of this crafty method of the Jesuits in converting nations, by a mandate issued A.D. 1744, has prostrated all these once most celebrated missions. This pontiff would have no wiles and tricks employed in the important work of extending the limits of the church. See Norbert's *Mémoires Historiques pour les Missions Orientales*, t. i. and iv. The entire history of these missions, together with a copy of Benedict's decree, is in Thom. Mar. Mammachius, *Origines et Antiquité Christianæ*, ii. 245, &c.—[Robert de Nobili was born of high parentage at Rome, in 1577; became a Jesuit at the age of twenty; studied philosophy at Naples, and theology at Rome. In 1606, he obtained leave to go as a missionary to the Indies, and was made an assistant to the Jesuit, Gonsalvo Fernandes, who, by ten years' labour among the Indians, had only been able to baptize a few natives who were at the point of death. Robert, early perceiving that the Indian ideas of *caste* formed a great obstacle to their conversion, and prevented all success among the higher castes, determined to convert this insurmountable obstacle into a successful engine. Having obtained the approbation of his plan by the archbishop of Cranganore, he assumed the habits and the garb of a Brahmin, shut himself up in a cell, avoided society, learned well the Tamul and the Sanscrit languages, and studied the sacred books of the Hindoos; and then came forth, avowing himself a foreign Brahmin, and a reformer of

But what is reported of the immense hardships and sufferings which they endure, for the sake of Christ, is thought by no small number to admit of some doubt. For they are said by many to simulate in public perfect models of rigid abstinence, and sufferers under various self-inflicted injuries, but in private to regale themselves with wine, flesh, and other such indulgences.

§ 8. The Jesuits were the first who brought a knowledge of the truth revealed by Christ to the inhabitants of *Siam*, *Tonquin*, and *Cochin-China*; *Alexander of Rhodes*, a native of Avignon, being the leader of the enterprise:¹ and vast numbers in those nations are said to have eagerly embraced it. Influenced by this good news, *Alexander VII.*, in the year 1658, thought it advisable to place some bishops over this new church; and therefore ordered certain French priests, of the *Congregation of priests for foreign missions*, to repair thither clothed with authority from him. But the Jesuits, who can bear no superiors, and scarcely any equals, treated those pious and good men with very great contumely and injustice, and would not suffer them to enter into their harvest.² Hence arose in the court of

the corruptions of the Brahminic religion. All admired his eloquence and his learning. He first gained one Brahmin to his Christian Brahminism; and then others, till the number amounted to seventy. These suffered some opposition from the other Brahmins: but Robert's chief difficulty was from the opposition of the catholics to his whole plan. The case was carried to Rome, and there warmly debated, and it was not without difficulty, that Robert was permitted to go on in his begun course. Yet he continued his labours nearly half a century, and then died at Meliapore, in 1656. After his death, his semi-Christian community declined for a time; but it was revived again by other Jesuits, and so enlarged, that in 1710 it was said to embrace more than 150,000 members. After the whole plan was condemned, however, by Benedict XIV., in 1744, the community rapidly declined, and soon became extinct. See Schroeckh's *Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation*, iii. 707, &c., and vii. 36, &c. Tr.]

¹ See the various writings and especially the Journal of Alexander de Rhodes, a man not lacking in genius and discernment, published at Paris, 1666 and 1682, 4to. [See *Relazione de' felici successi della S. Fede predicata da' PP. della Compagnia di Giesu nel Regno del Turchino*, Rome, 1640, 4to. His *Catechismus Latino-Turchinensis* is one of the most rare books; as also his *Grammat. Lingue Annamitice*, the vernacular language of Tonquin. Alexander went to that country in 1627, and in the space of three years converted more than 5,000 persons; among whom he formed some to be so good converts, that in 1634 it was estimated there

were more than 30,000 Christians in Tonquin. From Macao he entered upon a mission in Cochin-China; but after he had converted numbers, he was imprisoned, and banished the country. The mission, however, was afterwards prosecuted by other fathers. See *Relation de tout ce qui se passa à la Cochinchine*, Paris, 1652, 8vo. Christof. Borro, *Relazione della nuova Missione de' PP. della Compagnia di Giesu nel Regno de Cocincina*, Rome, 1631, 8vo, and *delle Missioni de' Padri della Compagnia di Giesu nel Regno del Turchino*, Rome, 1663, 4to. Schl.]

² There were various pamphlets published at Paris, in 1666, 1674, and 1681, in 4to, in which these French missionaries, whom the Jesuits refused to admit as fellow-labourers in enlightening idolaters, eloquently described their sufferings and their wrongs. The most accurate and full is the account given by Francis Pallu, whom the pope had made bishop of Heliopolis; printed in French, Paris, 1688, 8vo. The subject is also expressly taken up in the *Gallia Christiana* of the Benedictines, vii. 1027. A concise history of the affair is given by Urban Cerri, *Etat présent de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 199, &c. who, though he was secretary of the *Congregatio de Propaganda Fide*, inveighs with great severity against the frauds, the cruelty, and the lust of domination of the Jesuits; and laments, that his *Congregation* had not the power requisite to restrain that arrogant sect. At the close of his narrative he remarks, that he was not at liberty to state all the crimes committed by the Jesuits in this controversy, because the pontiff ordered them to be kept out of sight. 'Votre Sainteté a ordonné, qu'elles demeurent sous le secret.' See also Hipp.

Rome, a protracted contest; the issue of which plainly showed, that the Jesuits would easily resort to the authority of the pontiffs to extend and confirm their power, but treated it with contempt, when it opposed their interests and emoluments. Subsequently, the French king, *Lewis XIV.*, sent a splendid embassy, in the year 1684, to the king of Siam, whose prime minister at that time was a Greek Christian named *Constantius*, a crafty and ambitious man, soliciting that monarch to pay homage to our Saviour. The embassy was accompanied by many priests and Jesuits, among whom were several well skilled in the arts and sciences, for which the king had some taste. These induced a portion of the people to abandon the superstition of their fathers; but all their efforts to convert the king and the chiefs were in vain, and all hopes of adding the Siamese to the Christian church soon became extinct, together with the king, and his favourite, *Constantius*, who had invited the French into the country, and wished by their means to establish his own power. For in a sedition raised in 1688, some of the princes put them both to death,¹ whereupon the French were obliged to return home.

Helyot's *Hist. des Ordres Monastiques*, t. viii. c. xii. p. 84, &c.

¹ An account of this mission and its proceedings has been given by Tachard, Chaumont, La Loubere, and others. Among these the preference is due to Loubere, who was a man of learning and candour. [His work is entitled, *Du Royaume de Siam, par Mr. de la Loubere, Envoyé extraordinaire du Roy auprès du Roy de Siam, en 1687 et 1688*, 2 vols. 8vo, Amsterd. 1691. It is chiefly occupied with the geography of the country, and the transactions of the embassy. Father Tachard's book is entitled, *Voyages de Siam des Pères Jésuites envoyés par le Roy, avec leurs observations*, Paris, 1686, 4to, and Amsterd. 1699, 12mo. *Second Voyage au Royaume de Siam*, Paris, 1689, 4to, and Amsterd. 1699, 12mo. How far such Jesuitical accounts deserve credit, the world already knows. Here belongs also, *Relation de l'Ambassade de Mr. de Chaumont à la Cour du Roy de Siam, avec ce qui s'est passé de plus remarquable durant son Voyage*, Paris, 1686, 12mo, which was followed by *Journal, ou Suite du Voyage de Siam, par Mr. l'Abbé de Choisy* (who accompanied Mr. Chaumont), Amsterd. 1687, 12mo. The unhappy change which afterwards took place in Siam, to the disadvantage of the French, is described by Farges, a French officer, who was an eyewitness, in his *Relation des Révolutions arrivées à Siam dans l'année 1688*, Amsterd. 1691, 12mo; and by Father d'Orleans, in his *Histoire de Mr. Constance, premier Ministre du Roy de Siam, et de la dernière Révolution*, Paris, 1692, 12mo. *Schl.*—The politic *Constantius*, who had himself been in France, hoped to derive some advantages from a French alliance; and the Jesuit missionaries

united with him in representing the king as much inclined to embrace Christianity. But when Chaumont, the French ambassador, arrived (if we may believe the Jesuit Tachard), the king of Siam told the ambassador, 'that it was no light matter to change a nation's religion, after it had prevailed for more than 2200 years: and that he wondered the king of France should interest himself so much, in a matter that did not concern him, but God only; and one too, which God himself seemed to leave very much to the free choice of men. Could not God (said he), who gave to all men similar bodies and similar souls, have given them also similar views of religion, if he had seen fit? And as he has not done so, it is presumable, that he takes pleasure in being worshipped in so many different ways.' He, however, allowed Christianity to be preached in his realm. The French court, not less solicitous, probably, to secure the trade of the country than to change its religion, sent a second embassy in 1688, under De la Loubere; which was accompanied by a large military force. The French were now in possession of the port of Mequi and the castle of Bancop, which were keys to the country; and Constantius himself began to be alarmed. But the same year, the nobles conspired against this minister, and slew him; and in the tumult, the king himself lost his life. This revolution changed the whole face of things; and the French were obliged to quit the country. Yet probably some priests remained behind; for the very next year, it is said, some thousands of Siamese were baptized. At least, it is certain, Christianity was not exterminated; for near the close of the century, Urban Cerri states, that an

§ 9. China, the largest and most opulent of all the Asiatic kingdoms, was visited by great numbers of Jesuits, Dominicans, Franciscans, Capuchins, and others, at the commencement of this century, for the purpose of spreading the knowledge of Christianity. All these, though disagreeing in other things, unite in proclaiming the astonishing success of their labours. But the Jesuits justly claim the chief honour of surmounting the obstacles which opposed the progress of Christianity among that discerning and proud people, so tenacious of the customs of their ancestors. For discovering that the nation, which is naturally quick-witted, and eager to know the truth, was very fond of the arts and sciences, especially of the mathematics, the Jesuits sent over men who were not only well acquainted with human nature and discreet in managing affairs, but likewise profoundly versed in learning and the abstruse sciences. Some of these, by their address, the elegance of their manners, and their skill in business, soon acquired such influence, that high honours and offices were conferred on them by the emperor; and they were employed in affairs of the greatest consequence in the court itself. And supported by such patrons, other teachers of humbler rank and talents were able, without much difficulty, to collect disciples of every rank, sex, and age, in all the provinces of this vast empire.

§ 10. This prosperity was checked in some measure, when *Xun-Chi*, the first emperor of the Mogul race, died, and left his son a minor; for the chief nobles, to whose care and instruction the heir of the empire was committed, having long viewed Christianity with strong aversion, abused their power, to overthrow both it and its friends; and especially the Jesuits, whom they stripped of all their advantages, their fortunes, and their privileges, and persecuted with great cruelty. The first man among the Jesuits, *John Adam Schall*, venerable not only for the high office he sustained in the court, but also for his age and his extensive learning, was cast into prison, and condemned to be put to death, while the others were banished the country. This was in the year 1664. But in the year 1669, when *Cham-Hi* took the sceptre into his own hands, the prostrate cause of Christianity was not only restored, but moreover in process of time so advanced and exalted, that the Jesuits commonly reckon this the commencement of the golden age of the Christians in China. For the emperor, who possessed very great talents and genius, and was most eager in the search and investigation of truth,¹ first recalled the Jesuits to court, and restored them to their former rank;

apostolical vicar was residing in the capital, had a church there, and a seminary in which he educated natives for the priesthood; and that some of the great men of the court were professed Christians. See Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation*, vii. 54, &c., who refers to the authors above mentioned. *Tr.*]

¹ See Joach. Bouvet's *Icon regia Mo-*

narchæ Sinarum; which Godfr. Will. Leibnitz translated into Latin, and published in the second part of his *Novissima Sinica*, 1699, 8vo. Add Jo. Bapt. du Halde's *Description de la Chine*; and the *Lettres* of the Jesuits respecting their missions; in which they here and there extol the virtues of this emperor, whom all admit to have been a great man.

and then sent for others of the same family from Europe, especially such as were skilful in the different arts and sciences. Some of these he placed in the highest offices of the state, and employed in civil transactions of the greatest importance. And some of them, particularly Frenchmen, he received to personal intimacy, and made them his own teachers in various things, especially in philosophy and the mathematics. It was not difficult for the Jesuits, when thus exalted, to obtain many friends and supporters of Christianity, and to provide protection for its preachers. And hence, from nearly all the countries of Europe and Asia, many labourers entered into this harvest; and an immense number of people, with but little difficulty, were brought to profess Christianity. The religion of Christ seemed triumphant in China, when the emperor, who was so extremely partial to the Jesuits, in the year 1692 published that famous law, in which he denied that the Christian religion was injurious to the state, as its enemies contended, and gave all his subjects full liberty to embrace it; nay more, erected a splendid temple for the Jesuits, in 1700, within the limits of his own palace.¹

§ 11. That the Jesuits actually did and accomplished all that is above stated, is not denied even by their worst enemies: but whether their mode of proceeding was regular and right, or such as the nature and dignity of the Christian religion demanded, was long contested, and still is so, with great acrimony. The enemies of the Jesuits (and they are both numerous and very bitter, especially among the Dominicans and the Jansenists) strenuously maintain, that they purchased this success at the expense of committing offences and crimes of a detestable character. In the first place, they are charged with putting a very faulty construction upon the old religion of the Chinese, and persuading the emperor and his nobles, that there was very little, if any, difference between the ancient and original religion of China, or the precepts of *Confucius*, the great philosopher and lawgiver of that nation, and the religion of *Christ*: and to this execrable misrepresentation, it is said, they added others of less moment; in particular, they led the Chinese (who overrate everything ancient, and undervalue what is new) to believe that, many ages ago, the Chinese had been made acquainted with *Christ*, and had paid Him worship: and that to these false representations must be attributed the favourable disposition of the emperor towards Christianity, and the passing over of some leading men to the side of the Jesuits. In the next place, they are charged with being utterly

¹ A concise but neat account of all these events is given by Jo. Bapt. du Halde, *Description de la Chine*, iii. 128, &c., and by the Jesuit Fontaney, *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses*, viii. 176, &c. A more full account is in various books; of which, the most easy to be procured is, Joseph Suarez, *De Libertate Religionem Christianam apud Sinas propagandi Narratio*; published by Leibnitz, 1698, in the first part of his

Novissima Sinica. Most of the others are enumerated by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Lux Evangelii*, c. xxxix. p. 663, &c. See also my Ecclesiastical History of China, written in German, and published both in a separate work, and as a Preface to the German translation of Du Halde's work. [This work was published in an English translation in 1750, and, with a valuable Introduction and notes by the Rev. R. Gibbings, B.D., in 1862. *Ed.*]

regardless of the duties and the virtues which become the ministers of Christ. For they not only accepted, but eagerly sought after, honours and civil offices: and elated by the munificence of the emperor, their whole life was contaminated by the magnificence of their dress, the luxury of their tables, the multitude of their servants, and the splendour of their palaces; and that they devoted themselves not so much to spreading the knowledge of Christianity, as to teaching human science, especially the mathematics: and that they even took charge of military affairs, and commanded in the field of battle. And lastly, Jesuits of inferior rank are represented as engaging with eagerness in usurious speculations, in merchandise, and in other arts, by which wealth and worldly distinction are acquired, to the immense disgrace of their profession. Some of these charges the Jesuits admit indeed, but at the same time labour to extenuate; but the first and the last, they contend, are calumnious fabrications. And undoubtedly, those who have opportunity to examine the matter thoroughly, will be willing to admit, that envy and ill-will have had some share in this controversy.

§ 12. The principal charge against the Jesuits in China, is that they confound light and darkness; or that, the more easily to overcome the scruples of the Chinese, they mix the superstitions of China with Christianity, and allow their disciples to follow the profane customs and impious rites of their ancestors. The Jesuit *Matthew Ricci*, the father of the Chinese church, thought that the greatest part of the rites which are enjoined by the Chinese laws, might suitably be observed by the converts to Christianity; for they originated, he said, not from religious considerations, but from state policy; or were civil, and not religious ceremonies; nor were they viewed in any other light, except perhaps by some of the lower class of people.¹ A contrary opinion was embraced, not only by the Dominicans and Franciscans, who were associated with the Jesuits in the mission, but also by very learned men among the Jesuits themselves, both in China and Japan, one of whom, *Nicolas Lombard*, stated the grounds of his dissent in writing.² This controversy, having been long agitated in private, was brought to Rome by the Dominicans, in the year 1645; and since then, it has greatly disturbed the whole Roman church. *Innocent X.*, in the year just named, decided in favour of the Dominicans, and condemned the indulgence allowed by the Jesuits to the Chinese. But *Alexander VII.*, in the year 1656, at the instigation of the Jesuits, nullified this decision, in effect, though not in express terms; and declared that certain rites to which the Chinese were attached, might be observed by Christians. The Dominicans renewed their complaints, in the

¹ See Mammachius, *Origines et Antiquit. Christianæ*, ii. p. 373, &c.

² See Christ. Kortholt's Preface to the second volume of Leibnitz's Epistles, § vi. p. 18, &c. who has subjoined to this volume the tracts of Nic. Lombard and Antony de

St. Maria, against the Jesuits, with the remarks of Leibnitz. There is also in this work (p. 413) a long dissertation of Leibnitz, addressed to Remond, on the philosophy of the Chinese; in which he pleads the cause of the Jesuits.

years 1661 and 1674, under the pontificate of *Clement X.*; but they seem to have been foiled by the power of the Jesuits. In the year 1684, this fatal controversy was renewed in China, where it had been at rest for several years, and was prosecuted with greater warmth than before. Victory seemed inclining to the side of the Dominicans, when *Charles Maigrot*, a doctor of the Sorbonne, whom the pontiff had constituted his vicar in the province of Fohi, and who was afterwards bishop of Conon, by a public decree, in the year 1693, decided, that the opinions and regulations of the Jesuits were contrary to the purity of the Christian religion. But the pontiff, to whose authority *Maigrot* had subjected his decree, would not decide either way, on any part of it, until the whole cause should have had a legal investigation. Accordingly, in the year 1699, he appointed a board of special judges, or a *Congregation*, as the Roman court terms it, to give this angry contest a thorough examination. As soon as this resolution of the pontiff was made known, all the enemies of the Jesuits in the Roman church, and particularly in France, took the field; and in various pamphlets assailed the character and the proceedings of the Jesuits, in the most vehement manner. Nor were the Jesuits wanting in efforts on their own part.¹

The termination of this conflict belongs to the history of the next century.

§ 13. This controversy, which has called forth the talents of so many men of the finest genius, if we separate from it some minor questions, and such as relate rather to the Jesuits themselves than to the subject in debate, may be all embraced under two heads. (I.) The Chinese call the supreme god whom they worship, TIEN, and SHANG-TI; that is, in their language, *Heaven*. And the Jesuits transferred this name to the God of the Christians: whence it seemed to follow, that they thought there was no difference between the chief god of the Chinese and the infinitely perfect God of the Christians; or, that the Chinese had the same ideas of their TIEN or *heaven*, as the Christians have of God. But this the adversaries of the Jesuits deny. The first question, therefore, is, whether the Chinese understand, by the words specified, the visible material heavens, or the Lord of heaven, the eternal and all-perfect *Being*, whose throne is in the heavens, and who from that throne, in infinite wisdom, rules all human affairs; that is, such a God as Christianity presents to us for our worship. The Jesuits maintain the latter; for they contend, that these names were used by the ancient Chinese philosophers (who, they think, had just ideas of natural religion), to denote very clearly such a God as the Christians worship: and therefore, they would not prohibit their converts from continuing to use those terms, in their prayers and discourses, to

¹ Du Halde, *Description de la Chine*, iii. 142, &c. The other writers, who are very numerous, are mentioned by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Lux Evangelii*, c. xxxix. p. 665, &c. Add Voltaire, *Siècle de Louis XIV.* ii. 318, &c.

But especially worth reading is the ingenious patron of the Jesuits, and himself a Jesuit, Gabriel Daniel, *Histoire Apologetique de la Conduite des Jésuites de la Chine*; in his *Miscellaneous Tracts*, vol. iii. p. 1, &c.

designate the supreme Being ; nay, they used them constantly themselves, to denote the true God. But their adversaries maintain the contrary opinion ; and contend, that the ancient philosophy of the Chinese was full of impiety, and made no distinction between God, the divine Spirit, and nature or the material world. They assert, moreover, that *Confucius* himself, whom the Chinese hold in the highest veneration, was a stranger to religion and piety, and one who supposed, that all existing things arose necessarily into being in the course of nature. This disagreement gave rise to very learned discussions, concerning the customs, laws, and opinions of the ancient Chinese ; which have, indeed, made us acquainted with many things that were previously not well understood, but they have not decided the point for which they were undertaken. It seems, that entire assent is not to be given either to the positions of the Jesuits, or to those of their adversaries ; and that the TIEN of the ancient Chinese was indeed far inferior in his attributes to the God of Christians, but notwithstanding differed from heaven or the firmament.

§ 14. The ancient laws of China require the people, annually, at stated seasons, to honour their deceased ancestors, with certain ceremonies which seem to be of a religious nature ; and, moreover, all the learned men of the nation, at certain times, must pay a kind of worship, which also seems to have a religious aspect, to the philosopher *Confucius* (who is accounted the father of all wisdom), in buildings consecrated to him. Hence, a second question is, whether those honours, which the Chinese are required to pay to the souls of their deceased ancestors, and all the learned to *Confucius*, are civil honours, or religious ; whether they are *sacrifices*, or only regulations established for state purposes. The Jesuits say, that the ancient Chinese lawgivers instituted these rites, to keep the people in order, and to preserve the tranquillity of the state ; that the Chinese do not offer religious worship to the souls of their ancestors, or to *Confucius*, but only testify by certain ceremonies their grateful sense of the merits and benefits as well of their ancestors as of *Confucius*, and engage to tread in their steps. And hence they conclude, that it is allowable for Christians to observe these sacred rites of their country, provided they understand the true nature and grounds of them, and always keep in sight the object of their institution. And whoever wishes to see the cause of Christianity flourish and advance in China, can scarcely think differently from the Jesuits, whether their statements are erroneous or correct. For it has been established, by public law, for many ages, that no one shall be accounted a good citizen in that country, or be admitted to any office in the state, who does not perform the ceremonies in question. But the Dominicans and the other enemies of the Jesuits, contend, that these rites are no small part of the Chinese religion ; that *Confucius*, and the souls of their ancestors, are objects of religious worship to the Chinese ; and of course, that such as observe these rites, offer an affront to the divine majesty, and cannot be accounted Christians. The more candid among the Jesuits themselves do not

deny that this is a very difficult question to decide; and hence some of them, at last, resorted to the plea of necessity; and urged, that minor evils, if productive of the greatest advantages, are scarcely to be accounted evils.¹

§ 15. Japan, at the commencement of this century, was filled with an astonishing multitude of people, whom the Jesuits especially had convinced of the excellence of the Christian religion. But this very brilliant success was disturbed somewhat, partly by the hatred of Christianity, entertained by the national priests and some nobles in the court, which gave rise to severe persecutions, in one place and another, both of the newly-converted Christians and their teachers; and partly by the internal broils and contentions, among those who had the charge of this rising church. For here, as in other countries, the Augustinian, Dominican, and Franciscan missionaries, waged a most pernicious war against the Jesuits. They taxed them, both at the court of Rome and elsewhere, with insatiable avarice, with excessive indulgence both to the vices and the superstitions of the Japanese, with a crafty management unbecoming the ministers of Christ, with an eagerness to reign and give law, and with other crimes of no less magnitude. The Jesuits, on the other hand, complained, that their accusers, by their imprudence, their

¹ [‘The public honour paid to Confucius twice a year, used to be performed before his statue, erected in the great hall or temple, that is dedicated to his memory. At present they are performed before a kind of *Tablet*, placed in the most conspicuous part of the edifice, with the following inscription: *The throne of the soul of the most holy and the most excellent chief teacher Confucius*. The literati, or learned, celebrate this famous festival in the following manner:—The chief mandarin of the place exercises the office of priest, and the others discharge the functions of deacons, sub-deacons, and so on. A certain sacrifice, called *Ci*, which consists of wine, blood, fruits, &c. is offered, after the worshippers have prepared themselves for this ceremony by fasting and other acts of abstinence and mortification. They kneel before the inscription, prostrate the body nine times before it, until the head touches the ground, repeat a great variety of prayers; after which, the priest, taking in one hand a cup full of wine, and, in the other, a like cup filled with blood, makes a solemn libation to the deceased, and dismisses the assembly with a blessing. The rites performed by families in honour of their deceased parents, are pretty much of the same nature.’

‘Now, in order to know, with certainty, whether this festival and these rites be of a *civil* or a *religious* nature, we have only to inquire, whether they be the same with those ceremonies that are performed by the Chinese, in the worship they pay to certain

celestial and terrestrial *spirits* or *genii*, which worship is undoubtedly of a religious kind. The learned Leibnitz (*Præf. Novissim. Sini-corum*) undertook to affirm, that the services now mentioned were not of the same kind, and consequently, that the Jesuits were accused unjustly. But that great man does not appear to have examined this matter with his usual sagacity and attention. For it is evident from a multitude of relations every way worthy of credit, and particularly from the observations made on the Chinese missions, by that learned and candid Franciscan Antonio de S. Maria (*Epp. Leibnitz*, vol. ii.), not only that Confucius was worshipped among the *idols* and the *celestial and terrestrial spirits* of the Chinese, but that the oblations and ceremonies observed in honour of him were perfectly the same with those that were performed as acts of worship to these *idols* and *spirits*. Those that desire a more ample account of this matter may consult the following authors: Budæi *Annal. Histor. Philos.* p. 287, where he treats *De superstizioso Demortuorum apud Sinenses Cultu*.—Wolfi *Not. ad Casaubon*, p. 342.—Nic. Charmos. *Annot. ad Magrotti Historiam Cultus Sinensis*. But more especially Arnaud, *Morale Pratique des Jésuites*, tom. iii. vi. vii. and a collection of historical relations published at Cologne, in 8vo, in the year 1700, under the following title: *Historia Cultus Sinen-sium, seu varia scripta de Cultibus Sinarum inter Vicarios Apostolicos, et PP. S. I. controversiis.* Macl.]

ignorance of human nature, their pertinacity, the asperity of their manners, their rustic mode of life, and other faults, injured, rather than promoted, the growth of Christian principles among a high-minded and discerning people. Yet all these causes were by no means adequate to arrest the progress of Christianity, or to bring any great evil upon the immense multitude which had made profession of this religion. And, perhaps, means might have been devised at Rome, if not for entirely removing, yet for quieting and tempering these contentions.¹

§ 16. But in the year 1615, the emperor of Japan himself commenced a most direful persecution against the Christians, the like to which is not to be found in the whole history of the Christian church; and this persecution continued many years, and did not cease, until it had exterminated Christianity from that empire. For the Christian religion was judged to be pestilent and intolerable; because injurious to the safety of the nation, and to the majesty of their supreme pontiff, whom the populace of Japan believed to be the offspring of the gods themselves, and also to the most sacred institutions and religion of their ancestors. The foreign Christians, therefore, the Portuguese especially, and the Spaniards, were required to depart the kingdom; and the Japanese, who had renounced their idols, were required to abandon Christ, or undergo the most cruel death. This dreadful persecution destroyed an innumerable multitude of people, of every class, age, sex, and rank, who chose to die amidst the most exquisite tortures, rather than break the faith once pledged with Christ. And if either the Jesuits, or their adversaries, were guilty of faults while pleading the cause of Christ, they now, as it were, atoned for them, by their own blood. For most of them surrendered themselves to death for Christ, with the greatest firmness, and some of them with joy and triumph. The causes of this horrid persecution are differently stated by different parties. The Jesuits throw some of the blame on the imprudent conduct of the Dominicans and Franciscans: and these, in return, ascribe it to the avaricious, factious, arrogant temper of the Jesuits.² And both accuse the Dutch and the English of studiously

¹ Besides the writers mentioned by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Lux Evangelii*, c. xl. p. 678, &c. see Domin. Charlevoix, *Histoire de Japon*, t. ii. l. xi. &c. p. 57, &c.

² Engelbert Kaempfer has given a neat account of this protracted business, in the sixth of those Dissertations, which he has annexed to his history of Japan; § 4, &c. p. 64—75, of the English edition. But it will also be reasonable to hear the fuller statement of Domin. Charlevoix, who has omitted nothing that would go to excuse the Jesuits; in his *Histoire générale de Japon*, t. ii. l. xii. p. 136, &c. The other writers are mentioned by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Lux Evangelii*, c. xl. p. 678. Add the *Acta Sanctorum*, *Februarii*, i. 723, &c. where may be seen the History of the

church founded in Japan, and the life and death of those who were first put to death by the Japanese, on account of Christianity. Mammachius, *Origines et Antiquit. Christianæ*, ii. 376, &c. [Francis Xavier first preached the gospel in Japan, in 1549. After he left that country in 1552, great numbers were converted; and some Japanese became Jesuits. Schools and churches were erected even in the capital of Meaco. In 1586, a Japanese embassy was sent to Rome. Christianity now seemed about to become the prevailing religion; there were at least 200,000 Christians; and among them, princes, courtiers, chief nobles, and generals; the Bonzes and their religion were openly ridiculed; and the emperor had excluded paganism alto-

inflaming the emperor of Japan with hatred against the Portuguese and Spaniards, and also against the Roman pontiff, so that they alone might have sway among the Japanese, and secure their commerce to themselves. The Dutch and English reply, that neither the Spaniards nor any other adherents to the Roman pontiff were by them accused, but only that the perfidy of the Spaniards was laid open. And indeed, nearly all are agreed in this, that the emperor was persuaded by certain letters intercepted by the Dutch, and by other evidence bearing a strong probability, that the Jesuits and the other teachers of the new religion designed to raise a sedition, by means of their disciples, and to bring Japan under the power of the Spanish king; and hence the

gether from a new city which he founded; and he was on terms of intimacy with the Jesuits. But the base conduct of the Europeans led the emperor to suspect Christianity to be all a farce; and he became jealous of the designs of these strangers. He was also offended at the refusal of some converted females to surrender to him their chastity: and at the instigation of his favourite, in 1587, he commenced a persecution. All Jesuits were ordered to quit the country. Some obeyed, but others remained under the protection of the nobles. Out of about 250 churches, 70 were pulled down. In 1590, more than 20,000 Christians lost their lives. But the next year added 12,000 new converts. In 1596, a Spanish sea-captain, driven upon the coast, showed a chart of extensive countries subject to his master; and being asked how his master could conquer so many nations, he said their missionaries went forward, and prepared the minds of the people to favour him, and then fleets and armies made an easy conquest. This statement was transmitted to court, and produced great jealousy of the missionaries. The emperor swore the Spaniards should never thus conquer Japan; and immediately set himself to exterminate Christianity, which he called a devilish law. The missionaries were imprisoned; and not a few of them, as well as their converts, were put to death. The persecution continued several years. Yet in 1603, there were 120 Jesuits, most of them priests, in Japan. After this, an English officer of a Dutch ship cautioned the Japanese to beware of the military enterprises of the Spaniards; and represented the priests as designing men, who had been excluded from most European countries, and who did not teach genuine Christianity. This produced a fresh persecution: and in the province of Nangasaki, where there had been more than 40,000 Christians, not one could be found in 1622; all had either renounced their religion or been put to death. Hitherto, however, the number of Chris-

tians in Japan had not diminished greatly; and some estimates make them to have been about 400,000, and others near 600,000. But now things began to take a different turn. In 1616, Ijeas, guardian to the young prince Fidejori (who was favourable to Christianity, as were many of the nobles), slew his ward, and proclaimed himself emperor. The Jesuits were objects of his jealousy; and various causes induced him to forbid the further spread of Christianity, and the ingress of monks and priests into the country. He likewise determined to bring back the Japanese Christians to the old religion. Edicts were issued for these purposes; but they were not at once rigorously executed. At length some Franciscan friars, sent as envoys from the Spanish governor of Manilla, imprudently ventured to preach openly in the streets of Meaco, and to erect a church there. This exasperated the government, and brought on a persecution, which is without a parallel in the annals of the church. Among the causes of it were the intercepted letters mentioned in the text, giving account of a projected insurrection of the Christians, as soon as a Spanish force should appear on the coast. As soon as these letters reached the court, in 1637, decrees were passed requiring all foreigners to quit the country at once on pain of death; and subjecting every foreigner to the same penalty, who should ever after set his foot in the country. The return of the Japanese Christians to paganism was now peremptorily required, on pain of death. These decrees were rigorously executed: and two years after, the Portuguese were all driven from the country; and only the Hollanders were allowed to introduce a small quantity of European goods, and to live as it were imprisoned in a corner of the empire. Thus fell the Japanese church, after it had stood very nearly a century. See Schroeckh's *Kirchengesch. seit der Reform.* iii. 668, &c. Tr.]

tyrant, equally cruel and jealous, thought he could not be safe and quiet, unless he destroyed every vestige of Christianity. From this time, Japan has been closed against all foreigners; and even every shadow of the Christian name is exterminated with fire and sword. A few of the Hollanders, who are allowed annually to import a small quantity of European merchandise, live in an extreme corner of the kingdom, shut up as it were in a prison.

§ 17. Many respectable and pious men have endeavoured to enkindle a desire among the Lutherans of imitating the papists in efforts for imparting Christian truth to the nations buried in the darkness of degrading superstitions. No one entered more zealously into this business than an Austrian nobleman, *Justinian Ernest*, baron of Wels;¹ who proposed the formation of a society for this purpose, which should bear the name of *Jesus*.² But there were various causes, and especially the situation of the Lutheran princes, few of whom possessed any territories or fortified posts out of Europe, which prevented this matter from ever proceeding beyond good wishes and consultations. But the Reformed, and especially the English and the Dutch, whose mercantile adventures carried them to the remotest parts of the world, and who planted extensive colonies during this century in Asia, Africa, and America, enjoyed the best advantages for extending the limits of the Christian church. Nor did these nations wholly neglect this duty; although they are taxed with grasping at the wealth of the Indians, but neglecting their souls, and perhaps they did not perform so much as they might have done. Among the English, in the year 1647, by an act of parliament, the business of propagating Christianity was committed to the care of a society composed of men of the highest respectability and integrity. This society was revived in the reign of *Charles II.*, A.D. 1661; and again confirmed, and invested with extraordinary privileges and rights, by *William III.* in the year 1701; and being enriched with the splendid donations of kings, nobles, and private individuals, has continued down to our own times.³ From this noble institution, great advantages have been

¹ Liber Baro de Wels. [*Freyherr von Wels. Von Ein.*]

² Godfr. Arnold's *Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*, pt. ii. book xvii. ch. xv. § 23, &c. p. 1066, and pt. iii. ch. xv. § 18, p. 150. Jo. Möller, *Cimbria Litterata*, tom. iii. p. 75. [In 1664, this Hungarian baron published two letters, addressed to the Lutheran community, on a reformation of manners, and efforts for the conversion of the heathen. In the first, he proposed these three questions:—Is it right, that we evangelical Christians should keep the Gospel to ourselves, and not seek to spread it abroad?—Is it right, that we everywhere encourage so many to study theology, yet give them no opportunity to go abroad; but rather keep them, three, six, or more years, waiting for parishes to become vacant, or for the posts of schoolmasters?—Is it

right, that we should expend so much in dress, high-living, useless amusements, and expensive fashions; yet hitherto have never thought of any means for spreading the Gospel?—His proposal to form a missionary association was approved by some, but objected to by others, especially among the higher clergy. He himself advanced 12,000 dollars for the object; went to Holland on the subject; and at length took ship for the Dutch West Indies, to embark himself in missionary labour; but he was no more heard of. Some feeble attempts were made to get up a missionary association afterwards; but to no purpose, during this century. See the authors above cited. 2r.]

³ Kennet, *Relation de la Société établie pour la Propagation de l'Evangile par le Roy Guillaume III.* Rotterd. 1708, 12mo.—

derived, and are still daily derived, by many nations ignorant of Christ, and especially those in America. By the labours of the Dutch, an immense number of people in the island of Ceylon, on the coast of Malabar, in the island of Formosa, and in other countries of Asia (which the Dutch either conquered from the Portuguese, or otherwise brought under their power), are said to have renounced the impious rites of their fathers.¹ If perhaps some extravagance may be found in these narrations, yet it is most certain, that this nation, after it had obtained a firm establishment in the East Indies, adopted, at great expense, various measures well calculated to imbue the natives with a knowledge of Christian principles.²

[In 1649, an ordinance was passed by the English parliament, for the erection of a corporation, by the name of *the President and Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England*; and a general collection for its endowment was ordered to be made in all the counties, cities, towns, and parishes of England and Wales. Notwithstanding very considerable opposition to the measure, funds were raised in this manner, which enabled the society to purchase lands, worth from five to six hundred pounds a year. On the restoration of Charles II., the corporation became dead in law; and colonel Bedingfield, a Roman Catholic, who had sold to it an estate of 322*l.* *per annum*, seized upon that estate, and refused to refund the money he had received for it. But in 1661, a new charter was granted by the king; and the honourable Robert Boyle brought a suit in chancery against Bedingfield, and recovered the land. Boyle was appointed the first governor of the company, and held the office about 30 years. (See Wm. Brown's *History of the Propagation of Christianity*, i. 62, &c. ed. New York, 1821, and Neal's *Hist. of the Puritans*, ed. of Toulmin, Boston, 1817, vol. iv. p. 433, &c. but especially the *Connecticut Evang. Magazine*, iv. 1, &c.) It was this society which supported the various missionary operations in New England, during the seventeenth century. Their expenditure in 1661, amounted to 738*l.* 8*s.* 1*d.* or 3,282 dollars. *Tr.*]

¹ See the letters addressed to John Leusden, *de Successu Evangelii apud Indos Orientales*; published at Utrecht, 1699, 8vo.

² See Jo. Brauns, *La véritable Religion des Hollandois*, p. 71, 267, &c. Amsterd. 1675, 12mo. This work is an answer to the malignant tract of Stoup, entitled, *La Religion des Hollandois*; in which he would insinuate, that the Dutch have no regard for religion whatever. [The Dutch conquered Ceylon from the Portuguese, about the middle of this century; and immediately established there the protestant re-

ligion, excluding all others from every office. The Portuguese inhabitants, and the natives, both Catholics and pagans, in large numbers, embraced the established faith, at least in pretence. The country was divided into 240 parishes: a church was erected, and a school established in each. Every ten schools had a catechist, who was their superintendent. About 15 clergymen were assigned to the island. In 1672, Baldæus, one of the Dutch ministers, gives account of 30 native churches in the province of Jaffnapatam; in which were about 30,000 attendants on worship upon Sundays, and about 16,000 pupils in the schools during the week. Near the close of the century, Dr. Leusden wrote to Dr. Increase Mather, of Boston, 'that in and near the island of Ceylon, the Dutch pastors had baptized about 300,000' of the natives. (Mather's *Magnalia*, b. iii. vol. i. p. 510, ed. Harff. 1820.) The Dutch had also translated and published, portions of the Bible; besides catechisms, prayers, and other Christian books.—The Dutch having possessed themselves of a large part of the island of Java, opened a church in Batavia, the capital, in 1621. Pursuing much the same plans here as at Ceylon, in 1721 they could reckon 100,000 Christians in Java; and two Dutch, two Portuguese, and one or two Malay churches at Batavia. The New Testament in Malay was printed at Amsterdam, 1668, at the expense of the Dutch East India Company.—Soon after establishing the Gospel in Java, the Dutch sent ministers from Batavia to the island of Amboyna; and in 1686, it is said, they had converted 30,000 of the natives. Here, too, schools were established, and a number of ministers stationed, at the expense of the Dutch East India Company.—In 1634, the Dutch formed a settlement on the western part of the island Formosa. Robert Junius, of Delft, was sent out by the Dutch government to establish Christianity there. He is said to have baptized 6,000 persons; and to have set up

§ 18. As the interior parts of Africa proper have not yet been accessible to the Europeans, they still remain wholly destitute of the light of Christian truth. But in the maritime parts, especially those where the Portuguese have obtained settlements, the power of the barbarous superstitions has been undermined here and there, and Romish rites have succeeded in their place. Yet the ingenuous even of the Romish communion do not deny, that the number of those in this part of the world who deserve the appellation of genuine Christians, is but small; that the greater part so worship Christ as at the same time to follow the abominable superstition of their fathers; and that even the best of them have many defects. What little advances Christianity has made in that country, are to be ascribed altogether to the efforts of the Capuchins, who encountered incredible toils and hardships in bringing some of the ferocious nations of Africa to a knowledge of Christ. They persuaded, among others, the kings of Owerra and Benin of the truth of Christianity; and induced the very cruel and heroic queen of Matamba, *Anna Zingha*, in 1652, to allow herself and her people to be baptized.¹ For the Roman pontiffs, or rather the society at Rome which superintends the propagation of Christianity, have judged that African missions, for various reasons, were attended with peculiar dangers and difficulties, and could not well be performed by any but those early accustomed to austere modes of living, and to the endurance of hardships. Nor do the other Romish orders appear to envy the Capuchins very much this glory which they have earned so hardly.

§ 19. The India of the West, or what is commonly called America, is inhabited by innumerable colonists, professing the Romish religion, Spanish, Portuguese, and French.² But these, especially the Spanish

schools, in which about 600 young men were taught to read. He composed some prayers, and translated certain Psalms into the Formosan language; and though his labours were chiefly in the northern parts of the island, yet he had planted churches in twenty-three towns in the south, and had set pastors over them, when he returned to Holland. In 1661, the Gospels of Matthew and John were translated into the Formosan language, by Daniel Gravius, and printed at Amsterdam, together with a catechism. But, probably, before these books reached the island, it was captured by a Chinese pirate; and it has since belonged to the Chinese.— Besides the converts in these places, the Dutch made many others in Sumatra, Timor, Celebes, Banda, Ternate, and the neighbouring Molucca Islands. See Brown's *Hist. of the Propagation of Christianity*, vol. i. ch. iii. p. 15—28. *Tr.*]

¹ For illustration of these facts, besides Urban Cerri, *Etat présent de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 222, &c. see Jo. Anton. Cavazzi, *Relation Historique de l'Afrique* [d'Ethiopie] *Occidentale*; which Jo. Bapt. Labat

published in French, t. iii. p. 432, &c. iv. 28, 354, &c. and nearly the whole work, which is chiefly occupied with the history of the missions carried on by the Capuchins in Africa during the last century. [Dr. Maclaine finds all these references totally wrong. Schlegel says, Dr. Mosheim meant Father Fortunatus Alamandini's Italian *Historical Descriptions of the kingdoms of Congo, Matamba, and Angola*; Bologna, 1687, fol. whose statements the Italian Capuchin and missionary, Jo. Anton. Cavazzi de Montecavallo, has copied. And these last, Labat actually translated, in a free manner, into French, and published in five volumes, 12mo, Paris, 1732, under the title: *Relation Historique de l'Ethiopie Occidentale*. And this last is the work which Mosheim had in his eye: and not that of the same Labat, which was also published in five volumes, 12mo, in 1728, entitled, *Nouvelle Relation de l'Afrique Occidentale*. *Tr.*]

² See the authors mentioned by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Lux Evangelii*, c. xlviii. xlix. p. 769, &c. The state of the Romish re-

and Portuguese, as appears from the testimony of the most respectable men, themselves belonging to the papal church, are, even the priests not excepted, the lowest and most abandoned of all that bear the Christian name, and surpass the pagans in ridiculous rites and flagitious conduct.¹ Those of the aboriginal Americans who have been reduced to servitude by the Europeans, or who reside in the vicinity of Europeans, have received some slight knowledge of the Roman religion from the Jesuits, Franciscans, and others; but the little knowledge they have received is wholly obscured by the barbarism of their customs and manners. Those priests of the Roman religion, be their kind and order what it may, who have visited in modern times the wandering tribes of the forests remote from the settlements of Europeans, have learned by experience, that the Indians, unless they cease to roam about, and adopt humanised manners instead, are absolutely incapable of receiving and retaining on their minds the principles of Christianity.² And hence, in some provinces both of South and North America, Indian commonwealths have been founded by the Jesuits with great efforts, and guarded with laws similar to those of the Europeans; of whom, however, scarcely any are allowed admittance, lest they should corrupt the new citizens by their vices. In these communities, the Jesuits sustain the rank both of teachers and magistrates. But while, according to their own accounts, this reflects wonderful credit upon the merits and zeal of their order, others deny their claims; and maintain that they are more eager after public honours, wealth, and power, than for the advancement of Christianity; and charge them with collecting immense quantities of gold, which they have transmitted to their society in Europe,³ from Paraguay, or

ligion in that part of America occupied by Christians, is briefly exhibited by Urban Cerri, *Etat présent de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 245.

¹ See, in particular, Frezier, *Voyage de la Mer du Sud*, p. 167, 218, 328, 353, 402, 417, 432, 533.

² An immense number of facts on this subject are found in the Letters, which the French Jesuits wrote to their European friends, respecting the success of their missions, and caused to be published at Paris.

³ Jo. Bapt. Labat, when asked by Tamburini, the general of the order of the Jesuits, what progress Christianity was making among the Americans, boldly and frankly said: 'Either none or very little; that he had not met with one adult, among those tribes, who was truly a Christian; that the preachers among them were useful, only by baptizing occasionally infants that were at the point of death.' *Voyage du P. Labat en Espagne et en Italie*, viii. 7. 'Je lui répondis qu'on n'y avoit fait jusqu'à présent d'autres progrès que de baptiser quelques enfans moribonds, sans avoir pu convertir véritablement aucun adulte.' He

added, that to make the Americans Christians, they must first be made *men*: 'Qu'il en falloit faire des hommes, avant que d'en faire des Chrétiens.' This resolute Dominican, who had been a missionary in the American islands, wished to give the father of the Jesuits some salutary counsels respecting the immense possessions and wealth of his sons in the American islands: but the cautious old man dexterously avoided the subject: 'Je voulus le mettre sur les biens que la Compagnie possède aux Isles: il éluda délicatement cet Article.' With no less spirit, the same Labat checked the supreme pontiff himself, Clement XI., who commended the activity of the Spaniards and Portuguese in furthering the salvation of the Americans, but taxed the French with negligence in this very important matter: the Spaniards and the Portuguese, said Labat, have no cause to boast of the success of their labours: they only induce the Indians to *feign* themselves Christians, through fear of tortures and death. 'Les missionnaires Espagnols et Portugais n'avoient pas sujet de se vanter des prétendues conversions des Indiens, puisqu'il étoit constant qu'ils n'avoient fait

Paraquaria, which is subject to their sole authority, and from other countries.

§ 20. In the American provinces occupied by the British in this century, the cause of Christianity was more wisely and therefore more successfully urged in opposition to the stupidity and amazing listlessness of the Indians. The glory of commencing this most important work is justly claimed by those *Independents*, as they are called, who were driven to forsake their country because they dissented from the religion established by law. Some families of this sect, that they might transmit uncontaminated to their children the religious principles which they had embraced, removed in the year 1620 from Holland to New England, and there laid the foundation of a new commonwealth.¹ As these first adventurers were not unsuccessful, they were followed, in 1629, by very many of those called *Puritans* in England; who were impatient of the evils with which they were harassed by the bishops, and by the court's favour to the bishops.² But these emigrants, at first, had to encounter so many hardships and difficulties in the dreary and uncultivated wilderness, that they could pay but little attention to the instruction of the Indians. More courage and more leisure for such enterprises were enjoyed by the new Puritan exiles from England, who went to America in 1623³ and subsequently, *Thomas Mayhew*, *Thomas Shepherd*, *John Eliot*, and many others. All these merited high praise by their efforts for the salvation of the Americans; but none more than *Eliot*, who by translat-

que des *hypocrites*, que la crainte de la mort ou des tourmens avoit forcez à recevoir le baptême, et qui étoient demeurez, après l'avoir reçu, aussi *idolâtres* qu'auparavant.' *loc. cit.* p. 12. To this testimony, so very recent and of so high authority, so many more ancient might be added, that it would be difficult to recount them. See also, respecting the American Jesuits, the *Mémoire touchant l'Etablissement considérable des Pères Jésuites dans les Indes d'Espagne*; which is added to Frezier's *Relation du Voyage de la Mer du Sud*, p. 577, &c. Franc. Coreal, *Voyages aux Indes Occidentales*, ii. 67, 43, &c. See also, Mammachius, *Origines et Antiquit. Christianæ*, ii. 337, &c. Respecting the Jesuits occupying the province of Paraquaria or Paraguay, see Ulloa, *Voyage d'Amérique*, i. 540, &c. and Ludov. Anton. Muratori's tract, published in 1743, in which he pleads their cause against their accusers. [A full history of the Jesuits' republic of Paraguay, in which their proceedings are described in the most favourable manner, is Fr. Xav. Charlevoix, *Histoire de Paraguay*, 6 tomes, 12mo, Paris, 1767; and in English, 2 vols. 8vo, Lond. 1769. This republic maintained a war against the united forces of Spain and Portugal in 1752; which proved ruinous

to the Jesuits, by inflaming sovereign princes against them, and causing their character and proceedings to be more closely scrutinised. See *La République des Jésuites au Paraguay renversée*, Amsterd. 1758, printed in accordance with the views of the Portuguese court; and various works, both for and against the Jesuits, published about that time. *Tr.*—The Jesuits were expelled from Paraguay in 1767; their missionary establishment fell with them; their settlements became a desert, and the mass of their converts was merged again among the barbarous natives. See Mansfield's *Brazil and Paraguay*, p. 444. *Ed.*]

¹ Dan. Neal's *Hist. of the Puritans*, ii. 128. Ant. Wilh. Böhm's *Englische Reformations-historie*, b. vi. ch. v. p. 807, &c. [Cotton Mather's *Eccles. Hist. of New England*, b. i. ch. ii. &c. Prince's *New England Chronology*; Holmes's *American Annals*, vol. i. and the other histories of the first planting of colonies in New England. *Tr.*]

² Increase Mather's *History of New England*, p. 126, &c. Dan. Neal's *History of the Puritans*, ii. 208, &c. [Cotton Mather's *Eccles. History of New England*, b. i. ch. iv. &c. and the other writers mentioned in the preceding note. *Tr.*]

³ [1633. *Tr.*]

ing the holy Scriptures and other religious books into the Indian language, and by collecting and instructing properly no small number of Christian converts among the barbarians, obtained after his death the honourable title of the *Apostle of the Indians*.¹ These happy

¹ Jo. Hornbeck, *de Conversione Indor. et Gentil.* l. ii. c. xv. p. 260. Increase Mather's *Epistola de Successu Evangelii apud Indos Occidentales ad Joh. Leusdenium*, Utrecht, 1699, 8vo [published also in English, in Cotton Mather's *Ecol. Hist. of New Eng.* b. iii. p. 506, &c. ed. Hartf. 1820; and in the *Connecticut Evangelical Magazine*, iv. 164, &c.—The Rev. John Eliot was born in England A. D. 1604. After leaving the university, he taught school a few years, and then removed to New England in 1631, in order to preach the Gospel without molestation. The church in Boston would have settled him as a colleague with Mr. Wilson; but he had promised several friends in England, that, if they removed to America, he would become their pastor. Accordingly, on their arrival and settlement in Dorchester, he was ordained over them, in November, 1632; and served them 58 years, or till his death in 1690. He early turned his attention to the Indians around him; learned their language in 1644; and two years after commenced a regular weekly lecture to them at Natic. It was in this year that the general court of Massachusetts passed an act, or order, to encourage the propagation of the Gospel among the Indians. Eliot was countenanced and aided by the ministers around him; who frequently supplied his pulpit in his absence, and were always ready to afford him counsel, and also to aid him occasionally, so far as their ignorance of the Indian tongue would permit, in imparting religious instruction to the Indians. He not only preached regular weekly lectures at Natic, but likewise occasionally to the Indian congregations at Concord, Dorchester-mills, Watertown, and some other places. In 1670, he visited *twelve* towns or villages, of Christian Indians under his care in Massachusetts and along the Merimack; in all of which there were Indian preachers regularly stationed, to serve them on Sundays, and be their constant spiritual guides. At Natic, there were *two* such teachers, and between *forty* and *fifty* communicants. For these natives he translated into the Indian language, primers, catechisms, the Practice of Piety, Baxter's *Call to the Unconverted*, several of Mr. Shepherd's Works, and at length the whole Bible, which was first published at Cambridge in 1664, and again just after his death. He set up schools in his Indian villages, introduced a regular form of civil government, and many of the useful arts and industry; and was the foun-

tain from which the Indian preachers under him drew all their knowledge. See Cotton Mather's *Life of Eliot*, in his *Hist. of New Eng.* b. iii. vol. i. p. 474—532. *Connecticut Evang. Magazine*, iii. 361, 441, iv. 1, 81, 161. Brown's *Hist. of the Propag. of Christianity*, i. 29, &c.—The Rev. Thomas Shepherd is erroneously placed among those in New England who diffused Christianity among the Indians. He was a silenced English Puritan, born in 1606, educated at Cambridge, came to New England in 1635, and was settled at Cambridge, near Boston, where he preached till his death in 1649. He was a distinguished preacher and writer on practical religion. See Mather's *Ecol. Hist. of New Eng.* i. 343, &c. and Brook's *Lives of the Puritans*, iii. 103, &c.—In the year 1641, Thomas Mayhew, senior, obtained a grant of Nantucket, Martha's Vineyard, and the Elizabeth islands, which belonged to none of the existing colonies; and the year following commenced a settlement at Edgarton on Martha's Vineyard. His son, Thomas Mayhew, junior, was constituted pastor of the English settlement at Edgarton; while the father was chief magistrate, or governor, as he was styled, of all these islands, until his death in 1681. The son having learned the Indian language, commenced preaching to the Indians in his vicinity, in 1646, on week-days; and Hiacoomes, a converted Indian, under Mr. Mayhew's guidance, instructed his countrymen on the Lord's day. In 1652, an Indian school was opened; and by the end of the year there were 282 converts to Christianity, who met at two places, the one three miles, and the other eight, from Mr. Mayhew's house. They were now formed into a regular church, and the work of conversion went on rapidly. In 1658 or 1659, Mr. Mayhew found the harvest so great and the labourers so few, that he determined to go to England and solicit aid. The vessel in which he sailed was never heard of after she left the port. Thomas Mayhew, senior, after the death of his son, took on himself the labours of an evangelist, in addition to those of chief magistrate. In 1670, two Indian preachers, Hiacoomes and John Tackanash, were ordained to the office of regular pastors and teachers of the Indian church, while governor Mayhew continued the evangelist or overseer of all the Indians. In 1674, of the 360 Indian families on Martha's Vineyard two-thirds, or about 1,500 persons, were professed believers in Christianity;

beginnings induced the parliament and people of England, after a few years, to resolve on extending the enterprise by public measures and public contributions. Hence originated that noble society, which derives its name from its object, *the propagation of the Gospel*; and which, in its progress, having increased in numbers, dignity, privileges, and advantages of every kind, has gradually enlarged and extended its efforts for the salvation of the nations estranged from Christ, and especially in America. Immensely more, as all must admit, still remains to be done: yet any one must be uncandid, or ignorant of such things, who can deny that much has been done, and with greater success than was to be anticipated. We shall hereafter have occasion to speak of *Pennsylvania*, in which people of all sects and religions now live and worship God in the manner they see fit. The Hollanders began to diffuse the knowledge of Christianity with great success in those provinces of Portuguese America, which they had conquered under the conduct of *Maurice*, prince of Orange;¹ but

and 50 persons were in full communion. There were then *ten* Indian preachers, and *six* different meetings on Sundays. At Nantucket, where the families were about 300, there were about *thirty* Indian communicants, and 300 professed believers in Christianity, *three* places of worship, and *four* Indian teachers. On the death of Thomas Mayhew, senior, in 1681, his grandson, John Mayhew, son of Thomas Mayhew, junior, having been some time minister to the English at Tisbury, in the middle of the island, took charge of the Indian congregation till his death in 1689. His son, Experience Mayhew, when arrived at the age of 21, succeeded him in 1694; and laboured among the Indians successfully for sixty years, or till about 1754. He was master of the Indian language, and translated into it various works for the use of his charge. He also composed a volume containing the lives of a large number of pious Indians, preachers, and others. See the *Connecticut Evang. Mag.* ii. 281, 361, 441, iii. 5, 161, 249, and Brown's *Hist. of the Propag. of Christianity*, i. 47, &c.—In the colony of Plymouth, Mr. Richard Bourne preached to the Indians in and about Sandwich in their own language. About 1660, he procured for them a permanent grant of the lands at Mashpee; formed an Indian settlement there, and a church, over which he was ordained by J. Eliot and others, in 1666. In 1674, his Indian charge embraced about 500 souls, of whom 90 were baptized, and *twenty-seven* communicants. He laboured among them about 40 years. Brown, l. c. p. 59. Mr. John Cotton, minister of Plymouth, understanding the Indian language, preached to the natives, south of Plymouth, in *five* different places, on week-days; and aided their Indian teachers to

preach to them regularly. In 1693 he had about 500 Indians under his care.—About the same time Mr. Samuel Treat of Eastham, preached in *four* Indian villages near cape Cod, to about 500 Indians; who had their native teachers for their regular preachers on the Lord's day. — At Sandwich also, Mr. Thomas Tapper preached regularly to about 180 Indians. — In Connecticut, something was done in this century for the religious instruction of the Indians. The Rev. Mr. Fitch of Norwich was particularly desired to teach Uncas, a sachem, and his family, Christianity. Mr. Stone and Mr. Newton were employed, at the desire of the colony, to teach the Indians in Hartford, Windsor, Farmington, and that vicinity. Rev. Mr. Pearson of Killingworth, who had learned their language, seems to have preached to some of them. And the ministers of the several towns, where Indians lived, instructed them as they had opportunity. But no Indian church was ever formed in this colony. Trumbull's *Hist. of Connecticut*, vol. i. ch. xix. p. 494, &c.—The state of Christianity among the Indians of New England in 1687, was thus described by Increase Mather, in his letter to Leusden: — 'There are *six* churches of baptized Indians in New England, and *eighteen* assemblies of catechumens professing the name of Christ. Of the Indians, there are four-and-twenty, who are preachers of the Word of God: and besides these there are four English ministers, who preach the Gospel in the Indian tongue.' *Tr.*]

¹ Jo. Henr. Hottinger's *Topographia Ecclesiastica*, p. 47. Fran. Mich. Janisson's *Etat présent des Provinces Unies*, i. 396, &c. He also treats of Surinam, and the state of religion there, in c. xiv. p. 407.

all these prospects were intercepted when the Portuguese recovered the possessions that they had lost subsequently to the year 1644. Nor did the Dutch, so far as I know, expend much labour and effort in improving the minds of the Indians that inhabited Surinam and the adjacent regions.

§ 21. The enemies of all religion, and especially of Christianity, in this century, are represented by some as more numerous, and by others as less so, according to the party and the views which they have embraced. The English complain, that from the times of *Charles II.* their nation was contaminated with the grossest of vices and profligacy; that this state of things gave rise to unbridled licentiousness of speculation, and disputation on religious subjects; and that both united, produced a multitude of persons who prostituted their talents and ingenuity to extinguish all sense of religion and piety. And that these complaints were not groundless, appears both from the numerous examples of Englishmen of this period, who either declared war against all religion, or who maintained that the religion of nature and reason was alone to be followed; and also from the many excellent treatises by which the most solid writers of the nation defended the divinity and excellence of Christianity against the injuries of these men. The strongest evidence, however, is the noble institution of a very learned gentleman, *Robert Boyle*; ¹ who bequeathed, by his will, in 1691, a splendid portion of his estate to religion; the income of which was to be annually paid over to acute and eloquent men, who should oppose the progress of impiety, and demonstrate and confirm the truth of natural and revealed religion, in eight public discourses each year. ² Down to our times, men of the greatest talents and genius have undertaken this service; and their discussions or discourses have been laid before the public, to the great advantage of all Europe. ³

§ 22. By the English generally, *Thomas Hobbes* of Malmesbury is

¹ [This excellent man, who has been emphatically called *the great Christian philosopher*, was the seventh son of Richard Boyle, commonly known as *the great earl of Cork*, and was consequently entitled, by the courtesy of England, to the designation of *the Honourable*: which is generally connected with his name. He was born at his father's seat, Lismore castle, in the south of Ireland, Jan. 25, 1627, and he died in London, Dec. 30, 1691. He was buried in the church of St. Martin-in-the-fields. As a natural philosopher, he was quite in advance of his age, and as a religious man, he has rarely been surpassed. S.]

² See Ricotier's Preface to his French translation of Sam. Clark's *Discourses on the Being and Attributes of God*. Of Boyle himself, and his merits, Edw. Budgell has treated very fully, in his *Memoirs of the Lives and Characters of the illustrious Family of the Boyles*, Lond. 1737, 8vo. See

the *Bibliothèque Britannique*, t. xii. pt. i. p. 144, &c. [But above all, the late learned Dr. Birch's *Life of Boyle*, published in 8vo, in 1744; and that very valuable collection of Lives, the *Biographia Britannica*, Article *Boyle*, Robert, note (z). See also article *Hobbes*, in the same collection.' *Macl.*]

³ A catalogue of these discourses is given in the *Bibliothèque Angloise*, t. xv. pt. ii. p. 416, &c. A learned and neatly digested summary of all the discourses of this nature, thus far delivered, was published not long since, in English, by Gilbert Burnet, which the French and the Germans have begun to translate into their languages. [This abridgment comprehends the discourses of Bentley, Kidder, Williams, Gastrell, Harris, Bradford, Blackall, Stanhope, Clarke, Hancock, Whiston, Turner, Butler, Woodward, Derham, Ibbot, Leng, J. Clarke, Gurdon, Burnet, Berriman.' *Macl.*]

represented as the leader and standard-bearer of the impious company who, from the accession of *Charles II.*, set themselves in opposition to God and to things sacred. He was a man daring, crafty, acute, and discerning, but richer in genius than in erudition, or in knowledge of things either divine or human.¹ He has, however, found some advocates out of England; who maintain that he erred indeed, yet not so disgracefully as to leave no room for a belief in God, and for the worship of him.² Those who shall read attentively the books that he has left, must admit that, if he was not destitute of all regard for God and religion, he clearly held principles which naturally lead to an utter disregard for everything sacred: and his writings betray, not obscurely, a mind most unfriendly to Christ and to the Christian religion. It is said, however, that, in his old age, he returned to a better mind, and publicly condemned the sentiments that he had formerly published:³ but whether he was sincere in this, is uncertain. With more truth it may be said of *John Wilmot*, earl of Rochester, who attacked God and religion with even more fury than *Hobbes*, that he became a penitent. This was a man of great discernment and brilliancy of genius, but of astonishing levity, and, while

¹ See Peter Bayle's *Dictionnaire*, ii. 478. Ant. Wood's *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ii. 641, of the late edition. [Add Brucker's *Historia Crit. Philos.* Appendix, Lips. 1767, 4to, p. 880, &c. where his life and character are described with impartiality and accuracy. He was, in Cromwell's time, a zealous adherent to the royalist party, and a defender of their rights, with a servile submission. Yet he lost the favour of the court, and died in 1679, in his 91st year, a private country gentleman. Two of his works, namely, *de Cive*, Paris, 1642, 4to, and his *Leviathan*, 1651, fol. are most worthy of notice. In them he recommends monarchic despotism, represents the human soul as material and mortal, discards all natural distinction between moral actions, and makes morality depend wholly on the enactments of monarchs. *Schl.*—The whole of the moral and political works of Thos. Hobbes, with a life of the author prefixed, were elegantly printed, probably under the eye of Warburton, Lond. 1750, fol. See Henke, *Kirchengeschichte*, iv. 399, note. *Tr.*]

² In defence of Hobbes, appeared, besides others, Nic. Hieron. Gundling, *Observ. Selectæ*, t. i. n. ii. p. 30, and in the *Gundlingiana*, pt. xiv. p. 304. Add Godfr. Arnold, *Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*, pt. ii. book xvii. ch. xvi. § 25, p. 1082, &c. Against these, appeared Jo. Fran. Buddeus, *Theses de Atheismo et Superstitione*, c. i. p. 187, &c.

³ This rests on the authority of Antony Wood; who states, in his *Athenæ Oxon.* ii. 646, that Hobbes wrote an apology for himself and his writings; in which he pro-

fesses never to have embraced the opinions that he proposed in his *Leviathan*, but to have brought them forward merely to try his ingenuity; that, after writing the book, he never defended those opinions, either publicly or privately, but submitted them to the judgment of the church; that those positions of his book, in particular, which seemed to militate against the received notions of God and religion, were published, not as true and incontrovertible, but only as plausible, and for the purpose of drawing forth the judgment of theologians concerning them. Wood does not tell us, in what year this apology appeared; which is evidence that he had not been able to examine the book. Neither does he state, whether Hobbes was alive or dead, when it was published. But its being placed in the list of Hobbes's writings posterior to 1682, leads to the conjecture, that it was published after his death: for he died in 1679. It does not, therefore, yet appear, what we are to think of this change of opinion in Hobbes. I can believe, that such an apology for Hobbes exists: but perhaps it was drawn up by one of his friends, to shield his reputation after he was dead. Yet, if it was written and published by himself, it can afford but little support to those who would defend his character. For the method which Hobbes takes to excuse himself is that in which all try to clear themselves, when they have incurred odium and indignation, by advancing corrupt and pernicious opinions, yet wish to live quietly, though continuing to be just what they were before.

his bodily powers were subservient to his will, libidinous and debauched.¹ Yet it was his happy lot, in the last years of his short life, through the admonition especially of *Gilbert Burnet*, to betake himself to the mercy of God and Jesus Christ: and he died religiously, A.D. 1680, seriously lamenting and detesting his former wickedness.² In this list may be placed *Anthony Ashley Cooper*, earl of Shaftesbury, who died of a consumption at Naples, A.D. 1703: not that he was an open enemy of Christianity, but his pungent wit, the elegance of his style, and the charms of his genius, rendered him the more dangerous foe to religion in proportion to the concealment that he practised. Various works of his are extant, and have been often published; all exquisitely fine from the native charms of his diction and thoughts, yet exceedingly dangerous to young and inexperienced minds.³ Rustic and dull, compared with these, was *John Toland*, an Irishman, who was not ashamed, at the close of this century, to disgrace himself and his country by several tracts reproachful to Christianity. But as those who furnish food for vicious propensities are seldom without admirers, so this man, who was not destitute of learning, though vain-glorious, and of abandoned morals, was thought something of by the undiscerning.⁴ The other Englishmen, of less notoriety, belonging to this class, need not be enumerated; yet if any one is disposed, he may add to the list *Edward Henry* [*Herbert*, baron] of Cherbury, a nobleman and philosopher, who, if he did not deny the divinity of the Christian religion, yet maintained that the knowledge of it was not necessary to salvation;⁵ and *Charles*

¹ See an account of his life and writings, in Antony Wood's *Athenæ Oxon.* ii. 654. On his poetic talents Voltaire treats, *Mélange de Littérature et de Philosophie*, cap. xxxiv. in his works, t. iv. p. 303.

² This scene is described by Gilbert Burnet, in a special tract, entitled, *Some passages of the Life and Death of John, earl of Rochester, written at his desire, on his death-bed*, by Gilbert Burnet, D.D. It is extant also in German, French, and Latin.

³ His works were first published collectively, Lond. 1711, in three volumes, 8vo, and are called *Characteristics* [of Men, Manners, and Opinions], from the title of the greater part of them. See Jo. le Clerc, *Bibliothèque Choisie*, t. xxiii. Some notes of Geo. Wilh. Leibnitz upon them, were published by Peter des Maizeaux, *Recueil des diverses Pièces sur la Philosophie*, ii. 245. There are some who maintain, that this otherwise great and illustrious man has been rashly accused, by clergymen, of contemning religion. I wish they could solidly evince that it is so. But, if I do not wholly mistake, whoever shall read but a moderate portion of his writings, or only his noted Letter on Enthusiasm, which in French bears the title, *Essai sur la Raillerie*, will readily fall in with the judgment which

Dr. Berkley passes upon him, in his *Alciphron*, or the *Minute Philosopher*, vol. i. dial. iii. p. 200, &c. This very ingenious man employs ridicule, when seeming to speak the most gravely on sacred subjects; and divests the arguments derived from the sacred Scriptures, in support of a devout and virtuous life, of all their power and influence: nay, by recommending an indescribable, sublime kind of virtue, far above the conceptions of common people, and which rests satisfied with itself, he appears to extinguish all zeal for the pursuit of virtue in the minds of common people.

⁴ In my younger years I treated largely of this man, in a *Commentatio de Vita et Scriptis ejus*, prefixed to a Confutation of his insidious book entitled *Nazarenus*. The deficiencies, if any, in that *Commentatio*, may be supplied from the Life of Toland, prefixed to his *Posthumous Works*, published in London, 1726, 2 vols. 8vo. The author of that life is Peter des Maizeaux, well known for various literary labours.

⁵ Lord Herbert is sufficiently known to the learned, by his book de *Causis Errorum* and other writings; but especially by his work de *Religione Gentilium*. And not less known, are the confutations of the sentiments he advances in these books, by John

Blount, the author of *The Oracles of Reason*, who committed suicide in 1693.¹

§ 23. In France, which faces England, *Julius Caesar Vanini*, an Italian, author of the *Amphitheatre of Providence*, and of *Dialogues concerning Nature*, was publicly burnt at Toulouse, in 1619, as a perverse enemy of God and of all religion. But some respectable and learned writers think that he fell a victim to personal resentment; and that he neither wrote nor lived and acted, so stupidly and impiously, as to be justly chargeable with contemning God.² But the character of *Cosmo Ruggieri*, a Florentine and a profligate, who died at Paris, in 1615, no honest man will readily undertake to defend. For when about to die, he boldly declared that he regarded all which we are taught respecting a supreme Deity and evil spirits as idle tales.³ Whether justice or injustice was done to *Casimir Leszynsky*, a Polish gentleman, who was punished capitally at Warsaw,

Musseus, Christ. Kortholt, and other celebrated divines. He is commonly considered the father of the family of *Naturalists* [or *Deists*]. See Godfr. Arnold's *Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*, pt. ii. book xvii. ch. xvi. p. 1083, &c. [Cherbury is properly the founder of the modern religious *indifferentism*. If we may believe him, the divine origin of Christianity cannot be proved, but only be rendered very probable. The whole of religion, according to him, consists in five articles: I. There is a God. II. He is to be worshipped. III. And this, by the practice of virtue. IV. Repentance and reformation will procure us pardon from God. V. After this life, the virtuous will be rewarded, and the vicious punished. *Schl.*]

¹ See *Chaufepie's Nouveau Dictionnaire Historique et Crit.* t. i. pt. ii. p. 328. He, however, omits his tragical death, from a regard, undoubtedly, to the feelings of the illustrious family of Blounts, still living in England. [Concerning all the English deists mentioned in this section, their works, their opinions, and the confutation of them, see John Leland's *View of the principal Deistical Writers that have appeared in England, in the last and present Century, with Observations*, first published in 1754, and since often, in 2 vols. 8vo. *Tr.*—Blount's work appears to have been connected with the misguided author's unhappy end. It was published in the early part of 1693, and contains observations upon the propriety of marrying the sister of a deceased wife. Blount was then anxious for such a marriage. He had married at eighteen, and having lost his wife, he made overtures to her sister, who favourably received them. But being informed, and by persons of weight, that such a connexion was illegal and improper, she altogether declined it. On this, in August 1693,

Blount shot himself through the head. Thus his *Oracles of Reason* really seem to have been published chiefly with the view of preparing the public mind for such a marriage as he had then determined upon attempting himself. He was born in 1654, and being the favourite son of a wealthy and clever, but wrong-headed father, he entered upon active life with all the seeds about him that eventually produced such bitter fruits. *S.*]

² See the compilations of Jo. Fran. Buddeus, concerning him, in his *Theses de Atheismo et Superstitione*, c. i. p. 120, &c. The author of the *Apology for Vanini*, which was published in Holland, 1712, 8vo, was Peter Fred. Arp, a lawyer of extensive learning, who promised a new and much enlarged edition of this little book, in his *Feria Estivales seu Scriptorum suorum Historia*, pt. i. § xl. p. 28, &c. His coadjutor, in vindicating the character of Vanini, was Elias Fred. Heister, *Apologia pro Medicis*, sect. xviii. p. 93, &c. [Vanini was a physician, and a wild, enthusiastic naturalist. He travelled in England, the Netherlands, Germany, France, and Switzerland; professed himself a Roman catholic; but he advanced, particularly in his last book, his *Dialogues*, such mystical and deistic opinions concerning God, whom he seemed to confound with nature, that he was burnt as a heretic, at Toulouse, A.D. 1619. See Schroeckh's *Kirchengesch. seit der Reformat.* v. 646, &c. Brucker, *Crit. Hist. Philos.* v. 670, vi. 922. *Chaufepie, Dictionnaire*, art. *Vanini*; and *Stäudlin's Beyträge zur Philos. u. Gesch.* i. p. 147. *Tr.*]

³ Peter Bayle's *Dictionnaire*, iii. 2526. [He was a great astrologer and soothsayer, and openly vicious; according to Bayle. *Tr.*]

in 1689, for denying a God and a divine providence, cannot easily be determined, without inspection of the record of his trial.¹ In Germany, a senseless and frantic man, *Matthew Knutzen* of Holstein, wished to establish a new sect of the *Conscientiaries*, that is, of persons who, neglecting God, followed only the dictates of conscience, or right reason: but he was easily checked and compelled to abandon his mad project.²

§ 24. *Benedict de Spinoza*, a Portuguese Jew, who died at the Hague in 1677, is accounted the first and the most acute of all those in this century, who transformed the Author of all things himself into a being bound down by the eternal laws of necessity and fate. He led, indeed, personally, a life more discreet and commendable than an immense number of Christians and others do who have never suffered a doubt to enter their minds respecting God and the duties that men owe to Him; neither did he seek to seduce others into a contempt for the supreme Being, or into corrupt morals.³ But in his books, especially those published after his death, it is manifestly his aim to prove that the whole universe, and God himself, are precisely one and the same thing; and that whatever takes place, arises out of the eternal and immutable laws of *nature*, which necessarily existed and was in a state of activity from all eternity. And if these things were so, it would follow that every individual is himself God, and cannot possibly commit sin.⁴ It was the Cartesian

¹ See Godfr. Arnold's *Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*, pt. ii. book xvii. ch. xvi. § iv. p. 1074. The records of the trial of Leszynsky were formerly kept in the very rich library of Zach. Conr. Uffenbach: but where they are since removed to, I do not know. [Yet, from what Arnold has brought forward, it is more probable that he was innocent, than that he was guilty. *Schl.*]

² See Jo. Möller's *Cimbria Litterata*, i. 304, &c. and his *Isagoge ad Historiam Chersones. Cimbr.* pt. ii. cap. vi. § viii. p. 164, &c. Matur. Veiss la Croze, *Entretiens sur divers Sujets d'Histoire*, p. 400, &c.

³ His life, accurately written, by Jo. Colerus, was published at the Hague, in 1706, 8vo. Yet a more full and circumstantial life of him was composed by Lenglet du Fresnoy, and prefixed to Boulainvilliers' *Exposition of the doctrines of Spinoza*, published at Brussels, or rather at Amsterdam, 1731, 12mo. Add Peter Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, iii. 2631. [He was born at Amsterdam in 1632, where his father, a Portuguese Jew, then resided as a trader. Educated among Jews, he early manifested talent, and also a propensity towards infidelity. He became a great admirer of Cartesian principles, and associated with men of education and philosophers. He was by trade a glass-grinder, and much famed for all kinds of optical glasses. His most

noted works were, his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, Hamburg (Amsterdam), 1670, 4to, and *Ethica Ordine Geometrico demonstrata*, published soon after his death, 1677, 4to. His style is dry, argumentative, and rather obscure. Towards the close of the 18th century, some of the German theologians began to admire his writings; and at this time (1831), it is said, that a large number of the most pious divines of Germany are Spinozists in philosophy. *Tr.*]

⁴ A pretty long list of those who have confuted Spinoza is given by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, l. v. pt. iii. p. 119, &c. and by Godfr. Jenichen, *Historia Spinozismi Lehnofiani*, p. 58—72. His real opinions concerning God must be learned from his *Ethics*, which was published after his death; and not from his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, which he published in his lifetime. For in the latter he argues just as if he believed in an eternal Deity, distinct from nature and matter, who had caused a system of religion to be promulged, for imbuing men's minds with benevolence and equity, and had confirmed it by events, marvellous indeed, but not supernatural. But in his *Ethics*, he more clearly explains his views; and labours to prove, that nature itself is God, by its inherent powers necessarily producing movements. And this aids the confutation of those, who contend that Spinoza was not so bad a man

philosophy, to which he entirely resigned himself, that, beyond all controversy, led *Spinoza* into these opinions. For, having adopted the common maxim of all philosophers, *that all things which truly exist, commonly called realities, exist superlatively in God*; and then assuming, as indubitable, that opinion of *des Cartes*, *that there are only two realities, thought and extension, the one peculiar to mind, and the other to matter*; it was natural and even necessary, that he should ascribe to God both these realities, *extension* and *thought*, without limitation or modification. And this done, it was unavoidable for him to make *God* and the *universe* identical in nature; and to maintain that there is only one real substance from which all others originate, and to which all return. Moreover, *Spinoza's* system of doctrine, as even his friends will admit, was by no means such as to captivate by its lucidness and the clearness of its evidence. For they tell us it is to be comprehended by a kind of *feeling* rather than by the understanding; and that even the greatest geniuses are in danger of misunderstanding it.¹ Among the disciples of *Spinoza* (who chose to be called *Pantheists*,² from the principal

as he is generally represented, and who adduce their proofs from his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*. Whether he gradually proceeded from bad to worse, or whether he cautiously concealed his real sentiments, from prudential reasons, while he lived, it is difficult to say. This, however, is attested by the most credible witnesses, that so long as he was alive, he did not publicly influence any one to think lightly of God and his worship; and he always expressed himself seriously and piously, when the conversation turned upon such subjects. See Peter des Maizeaux, *Vie de M. S. Evremond*, p. 117, &c. tom. i. of the works of the latter. This may also be easily gathered from his Letters, which are extant among his posthumous works.

¹ Peter Bayle, who no one will say was naturally obtuse and dull of apprehension, is charged, by the followers of *Spinoza*, with not having well understood the sentiments of their master, and therefore with not having solidly refuted them. See his *Dictionnaire*, iii. 1641, note. Lewis Meier bitterly complains, in his Preface to the Posthumous Works of *Spinoza*, p. 21, &c. that there was a general misapprehension of the views of this extraordinary man, whose opinions all harmonised with the Christian religion. Boulainvilliers also, the expositor of *Spinoza*, declares, in the Preface to a book soon to be mentioned, p. 153, that all his opponents had either maliciously perverted his meaning, or misunderstood it. 'Les réfutations de Spinoza m'ont induit à juger, ou que leurs auteurs n'avoient pas voulu mettre la doctrine, qu'ils combattent, dans une évidence suffisante, ou qu'ils l'avoient mal entendue.'

If this system of doctrine is so difficult, so far above common comprehension, that even men of the greatest and most acute minds may easily mistake in stating it, what conclusion shall we make, but that the greatest part of the *Spinozists* (who are said to be very numerous all over Europe) have adopted it, not so much from any natural superiority of their genius, as from the hope of indulging their lusts with impunity? For no rational and well-informed man will believe, that in so great a multitude of persons, many of whom never once thought of improving their intellectual powers, all can see through that which puzzles the most perspicacious.

² To relieve his poverty and satisfy his hunger, John Toland composed and published, at *Cosmopolis* (London), in 1720, 8vo, an infamous and corrupting book, entitled *Pantheisticon*; in which he exhibits the *Formula celebrandæ Societatis Socraticæ seu Pantheisticæ*; that is, the mode of conducting meetings among the *Pantheists*, whom he represents as scattered everywhere: and the morals of this faction are here graphically depicted. In this book,—than which none can be more pernicious to honest but unguarded minds,—the president and the members of the society of *Pantheists* confer with each other. He earnestly recommends to his associates and fellows attention to truth, liberty, and health, and dissuades them from superstition, that is, religion; and sometimes he reads to the brethren select passages from Cicero and Seneca, in which there is something favourable to irreligion. They solemnly promise that they will obey his injunctions. Sometimes the whole

doctrine of their master which they embrace), the first rank was held by *Lewis Meier*, a physician and a familiar friend of *Spinoza*,¹ one *Lucas*,² the count *Boulainvilliers*,³ and some others.

§ 25. How greatly all branches of literature, the arts and sciences, as well those which belong to the province of reason and the intellect, as those which belong to the empire of invention, memory, and the imagination, were cultivated and advanced with success in this century throughout Christendom, appears from innumerable proofs, which

company become so animated, that they simultaneously raise their voices, and sing merrily some verses from the ancient Latin poets, suited to their morals and principles. See Maizeaux, *Life of John Toland*, p. 77. *Bibliothèque Angloise*, t. viii. pt. ii. p. 285. If the *Pantheists* are such as they are here represented, it is not for wise men to dispute with them, but for good magistrates to see to it, that such impudent geniuses do not creep into society, and seduce the minds of citizens from their duty.

¹ Spinoza employed this Meier as an interpreter, to translate into Latin what he wrote in Dutch. He also attended his dying master, and in vain attempted to heal his disease. And he moreover published the Posthumous Works of Spinoza, with a Preface, in which he endeavours, without success, to demonstrate, that Spinoza's doctrine contains nothing at variance with Christianity. He was also the author of the well-known book, entitled *Philosophia Scripturæ Interpres*, Eloutheropoli, 1666, 4to, in which the dignity and authority of the sacred books are subjected entirely to the decisions of philosophy.

² Lucas was a physician at the Hague, noted for his panaceas, and for the obliquity of his morals. This flagitious man left a *Life of Spinoza*, from which Lenglet du Fresnoy drew the additions, that he made in the *Life of Spinoza* composed by John Colerus. There is also in circulation, and sold at a high price to those who can relish such writings, his Marrow of Spinoza's doctrine: *L'Esprit de Spinoza*. Compared with this, what Spinoza himself wrote, will appear quite tolerable and religious; so greatly has this wretched writer overleaped the bounds of all modesty, discretion, and good sense.

³ This man, of a prolific but singular and unchastened genius, well known by his various works relating to the political history of France, by his *Life*, or rather fable, of Mohammed, by his misfortunes, and by other things, was so inconsistent with himself, as to allow to both superstition and atheism nearly an equal place in his ill-arranged mind. For while he believed, that there was no God but nature, or the universe, he still had no hesitation

to record Mohammed as one whom God raised up to instruct mankind; and he believed that the future fortunes of individuals and of nations, might be learned from the stars. This man, from his great solicitude for the public good, was much troubled, that the excellent doctrines of Spinoza were misunderstood, by almost everybody; and therefore he voluntarily assumed the task of expounding and stating them, in a plain and lucid manner, suited to the comprehension of ordinary minds. His attempt succeeded; but it produced only this effect, that all now perceived, more clearly than before, that Bayle and the others, who regarded the opinions of Spinoza as irrational in themselves, and subversive of all religion and virtue, did not misjudge. His work merited eternal oblivion. But Lenglet du Fresnoy brought it before the public; and that it might be bought and read with less suspicion, he gave it the false title of a *Confutation* of Spinoza's doctrine; and added some tracts, really deserving that character, together with a *Life of Spinoza*. The whole title of this dangerous book is this: *Réfutation des Erreurs de Bénédict de Spinoza, par M. de Fénélon, Archevêque de Cambray, par le P. Lami, Bénédictin, et par M. le Comte de Boulainvilliers, avec la Vie de Spinoza écrite par Mr. Jean Colerus, augmentée de beaucoup de particularitez tirées d'une vie manuscrite de ce philosophe, faite par un de ses amis.* (This was Lucas, of whom we spoke before.) *A Bruxelles, chez François Foppens, 1731, 12mo.* Thus the wolf was penned among the sheep. Boulainvilliers' exposition and defence of Spinoza's doctrine, which, to deceive people, is called a *Refutation*, constitutes the greatest part of the book: nor is it placed last, as in the title-page, but occupies the foreground. The book also contains more than the title specifies. For the motley collection is closed by a work of Isaac Orobio, a Jewish philosopher and physician (who held not the lowest place among the friends and disciples of Spinoza), entitled *Certamen Philosophicum propugnate Veritatis divinæ ac naturalis adversus Jo. Bredenburgii principia*. This work was printed at Amsterdam, 1703, 8vo.

need not here be detailed. The minds of men, already awake, were further excited to go forward, and sagaciously shown the path they should pursue, near the beginning of this century, by that very great man, *Francis Bacon*, of Verulam,¹ the Apollo of the English; and particularly in his books *on the Dignity and the Advances of the Sciences*, and his *New Organ of the Sciences* (*de Dignitate et Augmentis Scientiarum*, and *Novum Organum Scientiarum*).² It would be vain, indeed, to expect that mankind, who are hindered by a thousand obstacles from seeing things nakedly and as they really are, should do all that he requires of the cultivators of science and literature: for this extraordinary man was sometimes borne away by his vast and intuitive genius, and required of men, not what they are able to do, but what he could wish might be done. Yet it would be injustice to deny that a great part of the advances which Europeans made in every species of knowledge in this century is ascribable to his counsels and admonitions; and especially, that those who had treated of physical and philosophical subjects, almost like blind men, by his assistance began gradually to open their eyes, and to philosophize in a wiser manner. And through his influence it was, I have no doubt, that, while most people in the preceding age thought all human knowledge to be comprised in the study of the Greek and Latin classics, and in an acquaintance with the liberal and elegant arts, many gradually ceased to think so, and saw that more wholesome aliments might be found for feeding the mind of a wise man.

§ 26. That the mathematical, physical, and astronomical sciences, in particular, were carried to so great perfection among most of the nations of Europe, as to make those who lived before this period comparatively but children in these matters, is quite unquestionable. *Galileo Galilei*, in Italy, supported by the grand dukes of Tuscany, led the way;³ and there followed among the French, *René des Cartes*, *Peter Gassendi*, and innumerable others; among the Danes, *Tycho Brahe*; among the English, besides others of less fame, *Robert Boyle*, and *Isaac Newton*; among the Germans, *John Kepler*, *John Hevelius*, *Godfr. Wm. Leibnitz*; among the Swiss, the *Bernoullis*. To these men of the first order, so many others eagerly joined themselves, that there was no nation of Europe, except such as hitherto had not laid all their barbarism aside, that could not boast of its excellent and renowned geometrician, natural philosopher, and astronomer. Spurs, as they say, were provided for the race, not only by the grand dukes of Tuscany, those hereditary patrons of all learning, and especially of those branches, but also by the very powerful monarchs of Great Britain and France, *Charles II.* and *Lewis XIV.* The former established

¹ [He was baron Verulam, and viscount St. Alban's. S.]

² See his Life, prefixed to the late edition of his entire Works, Lond. 1740, folio, and the extracts from it, in the *Bibliothèque Britannique*, t. xv. pt. i. p. 128, &c. *Mallet's Vie de François Bacon*, Amsterd. 1742, 8vo, where see especially his efforts to in-

troduce a better mode of philosophizing, p. 6, 12, 50, 102, &c. Add *Voltaire's Mélanges de Littérature et de Philosophie*, c. xiv. p. 125, &c.

³ See *Christ. August. Heumann's Acta Philosophorum*, written in German, pt. xiv. p. 261, pt. xv. p. 467, pt. xvii. p. 803.

in London, as the latter did in Paris, an Academy or Society of learned and inquisitive men, guarded against the contempt of the vulgar and the insidious influences of sloth by very ample honours and rewards; and whose business it was to examine nature most critically, and to cultivate all those arts by which the human mind is rendered acute in discerning the truth and in promoting the convenience and comfort of mankind.¹ These institutions and pursuits have been exceedingly useful, not only to civil society, but also to the Christian church. For by them the dominion of superstition, than which nothing can be more injurious to true religion, or more dangerous to the safety of the state, has been greatly narrowed down; the strongest protections have been set up against fictitious prodigies, by which people were formerly greatly affrighted; and the boundless perfections of the supreme Being, especially his wisdom and his power, have been most solidly demonstrated, as well from the character and structure of the universe at large, as of its component parts.

§ 27. A great deal of darkness was also removed from the religious world, by a knowledge of all history, but especially of the early Christian, which was everywhere acquired and imparted with far more accuracy than heretofore, by men of the most laborious habits. For the origin and causes of a great number of opinions, which antiquity and custom had rendered sacred, being laid open, numerous errors, which had before occupied and enslaved men's minds, now lost their authority; and in this way, light and peace arose upon the minds of many, and their lives were rendered more blameless and more happy. This knowledge restored reputation to several persons, whom the malice or ignorance of former ages had branded with the name of *heretics*; a circumstance which served as a protection to many pious and good men against the malevolent and the ignorant. It showed, that various religious disputes, which formerly embroiled nations and involved states in bloodshed, rebellion, and crimes, arose from very trivial causes; from the ambiguity of terms, from ignorance, superstition, envy, and emulation, or from the love of pre-eminence. It traced back many rites and ceremonies, which were once regarded as of divine origin, to polluted sources; to the customs of barbarous nations, to a disposition to practise imposture, to the irrational fancies of half-educated men, and to a foolish desire of imitating others. It taught that the rulers of the church had, by dishonest artifices, gained for themselves no small share of the civil power, and, by binding kings with religious terrors, divested them of their wealth. It showed that councils, the decrees of which were once regarded as divine oracles, were often conventions of ignorant, nay, sometimes of worth-

¹ A history of the Royal Society of London was published by Thomas Spratt, London, 1722, 4to. See *Bibliothèque Angloise*, t. xi. pt. i. p. 1, &c. ['A much more interesting and ample history of this respectable society has lately been composed and published by Dr. Birch, its learned

secretary.' *MacI.*] A history of the Parisian Academy of Sciences has been published by Fontenelle. A comparison between the two academies is made by Voltaire, *Mélanges de Littérature et de Philosophie*, cap. xxvi. in *Opp.* iv. 317.

less men. Several other things of the like nature might be mentioned. How salutary all this was to the cause of Christianity, how much gentleness towards those of different sentiments, how much caution and prudence in deciding upon the opinions of others, how much relief to the innocent and the good against the ill-disposed grow out of it, and how many pernicious artifices, frauds, and errors it has banished from human society, we may learn from daily experience of our own happy condition.

§ 28. Those Christians, who gave attention to Hebrew and Greek literature, and to the languages and antiquities of the eastern nations (and very many prosecuted these studies with great success), threw much light on numerous passages of the holy Scriptures, which were before either obscure, or misunderstood, and erroneously adduced in support of opinions rashly taken up, nay, made to teach error and false doctrine. And the consequence was, that the patrons of many vulgar errors and groundless opinions were deprived of the best part of their armour. Nor will the wise and the good maintain, that there was no advantage to religion from the labours of such as either kept Latin eloquence from becoming extinct, or, in imitation of the French, laboured to polish and improve the vernacular languages of their respective nations. For it is of great importance to the welfare and progress of the Christian community, that it should not want men capable of writing and speaking properly, fluently, and elegantly, on all religious subjects; by which means they may bring the ignorant, and such as are averse from religion, to hear with pleasure what they ought to learn, and readily to comprehend what they ought to know.

§ 29. The moral doctrines inculcated by Christ and his apostles, received a better form, and more support against various abuses and perversions, after the law of nature, or of right reason, had been more carefully investigated, and more clearly explained. The incomparable *Hugo Grotius* stood forth as a guide to others in this department, by his work *on the right of War and Peace*;¹ and the excellence and importance of the subject induced a number of the best geniuses to follow him with alacrity.² How much aid the labours of these men afforded to all those who afterwards treated of the life and duties of a Christian, will be manifest to any one that shall take the trouble to compare the treatises on this subject composed after their times with those which were previously in estimation. It is certain, that the boundaries of Christian and natural morality were more accurately determined; some Christian duties, the nature of which was not well understood by the ancients, were more clearly defined; the great superiority of the divine laws to the dictates of mere reason was more lucidly shown; those general principles and solid grounds, by which all the Christian's doubts, and conflicts respecting right and wrong in

¹ *De Jure Belli et Pacis*.

² See Adam Fred. Glafey's *History of the Law of Nature*, written in German, and

subjoined to a *Bibliotheca* of the law of nature and nations; Lips. 1739, 4to.

action, may be easily settled, were established; and finally was repressed, with unwonted vigour, the folly of those who audaciously maintained, that the precepts of Christianity were at variance with the dictates of sound reason, that they subverted nature, were calculated to undermine the prosperity of nations, rendered men effeminate, diverted them from the proper business of life, and the like.

§ 30. But it is proper to make some particular remarks on the state of philosophy among Christians. At the commencement of this century, nearly all the philosophers were distributed into two sects: namely, that of the *Peripatetics*, and that of the *Fire-Philosophers*, or the *Chemists*. And these two sects, during many years, contended warmly for pre-eminence, in a great number of publications. The *Peripatetics* held nearly all the professorial chairs, both in the universities and the inferior schools; and they were furious against every one who thought that *Aristotle* should either be corrected or abandoned; as if all such had been traitors to their country, and public enemies of mankind. Most of this class, however, if we except the professors at Tübingen, Helmstadt, Altorf, and Leipsic, did not follow *Aristotle* himself, but rather his modern expositors. The Chemical or Fire-Philosophers roamed over nearly every country of Europe; assumed the obscure and deceptive title of *Rosicrucian Brethren*,¹

¹ [*Rosæcruciani Fratres.*] It is abundantly attested, that the title of *Rosicrucians* was given to the Chemists, who united the study of religion with the search after chemical secrets. The term itself is chemical; nor can its import be understood, without a knowledge of the style used by the chemists. It is composed not, as many think, of *rosa* and *crux* (a rose and the cross), but of *ros* (*dew*) and *crux*. *Dew* is the most powerful of all natural substances to dissolve gold. And a *cross*, in the language of the fire-philosophers, is the same as *Lux* (*light*); because the figure of a cross + exhibits all the three letters of the word *Lux* at one view. Moreover, this sect applied the term *Lux* to the *secd* or *menstruum* of the Red Dragon, or to that crude and corporeal light, which, being properly concocted and digested, produces gold. A *Rosicrucian*, therefore, is a philosopher, who, by means of *dew*, seeks for *light*, that is, for the substance of the philosopher's stone. The other interpretations of this name are false and deceptive; and were invented and given out by the Chemists themselves, who were exceedingly fond of concealment, for the sake of imposing on others that were hostile to their religious views. The true import of this title was perceived by the sagacity of Peter Gassendi, *Examen Philosophiæ Fluddanæ*, § 15, in his *Opp.* iii. 261. But it was more lucidly explained by the celebrated French physician, Eusebius Renaudot, *Conférences Publiques*, iv. 87. Very much, though ill arranged,

respecting these Rosicrucian brethren, who made so much noise in this century, their society, institutes, and writings, may be found in Godfr. Arnold's *Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*, pt. ii. book xvii. ch. xviii. p. 1114, &c. [According to most of the writers on the subject, the name *Rosicrucians* was not assumed by all the Fire-Philosophers; nor was it first applied to men of that description; but it was the appropriate name of an imaginary association, first announced about 1610, into which a multitude of Fire-Philosophers, or alchemists, eagerly sought admission. The earliest writing professedly from them was either published or republished at Frankfort, A.D. 1615, in German; and afterwards in Danish, Dutch, and Latin; and bore the title of '*Fama Fraternitatis*, or Discovery of the Brotherhood of the praiseworthy order of the Rosy-cross; together with the Confession of the same Fraternity; addressed to all the learned heads in Europe: also some answers, by Mr. Haselmeyer and other learned persons, to the *Fama*; together with a Discourse concerning a general reformation of the whole world.' The next year, 1616, David Mederus wrote, 'that the *Fama Fraternitatis* and the *Confession* had then been, for six years, printed and dispersed in five languages.' In the *Fama*, p. 15, &c. the founder and head of the fraternity is said to have been one Christopher Rosen-Creutz, a German, born in 1388; who became a pilgrim, visited the holy sepulchre, and Damascus, where he was instructed by

which had some apparent respectability, as it seemed to be derived from the arms of *Luther*, which were a cross upon a rose; and in numberless publications, some of them more and some of them less able and severe, charged the Peripatetics with corrupting and perverting both reason and religion. The leaders of the band were *Robert Fluhl*,¹ an Englishman, of a singular genius; *Jacob Boehm* [or *Behmen*], a shoemaker of Görlitz; and *Michael Mayer*.² These were afterwards succeeded by *Jo. Bapt. van Helmont*, and his son, *Francis Mercurius*;³ *Christian Knorr*, of Rosenroth;⁴ *Quirin Kuhlmann*;⁵ *Henry Noll*;⁶ *Julius Sperber*;⁷ and numerous others, but of unequal rank and fame. Harmony of opinion, among this sort of people, no one would expect. For, as a great part of their system of doctrine depends on a kind of internal sense, on the imagination, and on the testimony

the wise men, and afterwards learned magic and the Cabala, at Fez and in Egypt: on his return to Germany, he undertook to improve human knowledge, and received several into his fraternity, in order to commence the business; and lived to the age of 100 years, a sage far in advance of the men of his age. This fraternity, it was said, continued down to the time of these publications. A vast excitement was produced by this publication in 1615. Some declared in favour of the fabled Rosicrucian society, as a body of orthodox and learned reformers of the world; and others charged them with errors and mischievous designs. But in 1619, Dr. Jo. Valentine Andreae, a famous Lutheran divine, published his '*Tower of Babel, or chaos of opinions respecting the Fraternity of the Rosy-cross*;' in which he represents the whole history as a farce; and gave intimations that he was himself concerned in getting it up. But many enthusiastic persons, especially among the Fire-Philosophers, continued to believe the fable; and professed to know many of the secrets of the society. Much continued to be written about them, for a long time; and indeed the whole subject is involved in great obscurity. See Godfr. Arnold, *l. c.* ii. p. 244–258, ed. Schaffhausen, 1741. H. P. K. Henke's *Gesch. der christl. Kirche*, iii. 509–511; and the authors there cited. For the origin and character of the *Theosophists* or *Fire-Philosophers*, see above, cent. xvi. sect. iii. pt. ii. c. 1, § 12. *Tr.*]

¹ For an account of this singular man, to whom our Boehmen owed all his wisdom, see Ant. Wood's *Athenæ Oxoniensis*. i. 610, and *Historia et Antiq. Acad. Oxoniensis*, l. ii. p. 390, &c. Concerning Helmont the father, see Henn. Witte, *Memoriæ Philosophorum*; and others. Respecting Helmont the son, see Joach. Fred. Feller, *Miscellanea Leibnitiana*, p. 226, and Leibnitz's *Epistles*, iii. 353, 355. Concerning Boehmen, see Godf. Arnold, and various others. Respect-

ing the rest, various writers must be consulted.

² See Jo. Möller's *Cimbria Litterata*, i. 376, &c. [He was a learned physician and chemist, wrote much, and ranked high as a physician and a good man. He died at Magdeburg, A.D. 1622, aged 54. *Tr.*]

³ [Concerning him, see Brucker's *Hist. Critica Philosophiæ*, t. iv. pt. i. p. 709, &c. *Schl.*]

⁴ [Christian Knorr of Rosenroth was a Silesian nobleman; who, together with no ordinary knowledge of medicine, philology, and theology, possessed a particular acquaintance with chemistry and the Kabbala; and was privy counsellor and chancellor to Christian Augustus, the palgrave of Sulzbach. He was born in 1636, and died in 1689. His most important work was his *Kabbala denudata*, in 2 vols. 4to, printed, vol. i. Sulzb. 1678, and vol. ii. Francf. on Mayn, 1684. He also aided the publication of many Rabbinical works: and particularly of the book *Sohar*, at the Hebrew press in Sulzbach, 1684, fol. See the *Nova Litteraria* of Krause, Lips. 1718, p. 191. *Schl.*]

⁵ [See, concerning him, Brucker, *l. c.* p. 706. Arnold's *Kirchen- und Ketzer-hist.* pt. iii. ch. xix. p. 197, &c. and Bayle's *Dictionnaire*, art. *Kuhlmann*. *Schl.*]

⁶ [He belonged to the gymnasium of Steinfurt in Westphalia, was afterwards professor of philosophy at Giessen, and at last, preacher at Darmstadt. He applied himself also to chemistry and medicine, and was a follower of Paracelsus. He wrote, among other things, *Systema Hermetice Medicinæ*, and *Physica Hermetica*; in which there are very many paradoxical propositions. *Schl.*]

⁷ [This man also belonged to the Rosicrucians. He was a counsellor of Anhalt-Dessau; and composed many Theosophic tracts, which were published at Amsterdam, in 1660 and 1662, 8vo. He died A.D. 1616. *Schl.*]

of the eyes and the ears, than which nothing can be more fluctuating and fallacious, this sect, of course, had almost as many disagreeing teachers, as it had writers of much note. There were, however, certain general principles, in which they all agreed. They universally maintain that no one can arrive at true wisdom, and know the first principles of all things, without analysing bodies by the agency of fire. They all imagine a sort of coincidence and agreement of religion with nature; and hold that God operates by the same laws, in the *kingdom of grace*, as in the *kingdom of nature*: hence they express the doctrines of religion in chemical terms, that are appropriate to their philosophy. They all contend that there is a sort of *divine energy* or *soul* diffused through the frame of the universe; which some call *Archæus*, others the *universal spirit*, and others something else. All of them have many superstitious things to say, about what they call the *signatures of things*, about the power and dominion of the stars over every corporeal object, men themselves not excepted, as also about magic and demons of various kinds. Finally, they all express their obscure and inexplicable ideas, in very unusual and most obscure phraseology.

§ 31. This contest between the Chemical and the Peripatetic philosophers subsided, when a new method of philosophizing was brought forward by two great men of France; namely, *Peter Gassendi*, professor of mathematics at Paris, and provost of the church of Digne, both a learned man and one thoroughly acquainted with elegant literature, eloquent also, and deeply versed in all branches of mathematics, astronomy, and other sciences; and *René des Cartes*,¹ a French gentleman and soldier; a man of an acute and subtle genius, but much inferior to *Gassendi* in literary and scientific acquirements. *Gassendi*, in the year 1624, forcibly and ingeniously attacked *Aristotle* and the *Aristotelians*, by publishing some *Exercitations against Aristotle*: but the work excited so much resentment, and was procuring him so many enemies, that he, from his love of peace and tranquillity, desisted from continuing the publication. Hence, only two books of the work which he projected against *Aristotle* were published; the other five (for he intended to embrace the whole subject in seven books) were suppressed in their birth.² He likewise, in an appropriate work, attacked *Fludd*, and, through him, the *Rosicrucian Brethren*:³ which was not unacceptable to the *Aristotelians*. At length, he pointed out to others, though cautiously and discreetly, and he entered himself upon, that mode of philosophizing, which ascends by slow and timid steps, from what strikes the senses to what lies beyond their reach, and prosecutes the knowledge of truth, by observation, attention, experiment, reflexion on the movements and the laws of nature;

¹ Renatus Cartesius.

² See Bongerel, *Vie de Gassendi*, p. 17, 23.

³ [The title of his book was: *Examen Philosophiæ Fluddianæ, sive Exercitatio epistolica, in qua principia philosophiæ Roberti*

Fluddi reteguntur, et ad recentes illius libros adversus Marinum Mersennum (a friend of Gassendi) scriptos respondetur, cum aliquot observationibus cælestibus. Paris, 1613, 8vo. *Schl.*]

that is, from the contemplation of particular events and changes in nature, endeavours gradually to elicit some general ideas. In these inquiries he called in the aid, especially, of the mathematics, as being the most certain of all sciences; and neglected metaphysics, the precepts of which he regarded as so dubious, that a man eager after truth can confide without fear in but very few of them.¹

§ 32. *Des Cartes* philosophized in a very different manner. For he abandoned the mathematics, which he at first had made his chief dependence, and betook himself to general ideas, or to metaphysics, in order to come at that truth which was the object of his pursuit. Calling in the aid, therefore, of a few very simple positions, which the very nature of man seems almost to dictate to him spontaneously, he first endeavoured to form in his own mind distinct ideas of souls, bodies, God, matter, the universe, space, and of the principal objects of which the universe is composed. Combining these ideas all together, and reducing them to a scientific form or system, he applied them to the correction, improvement, and solid establishment of the other parts of philosophy; always taking care, that what followed or was brought out last, should coincide with what went before, and seem spontaneously to arise from it. Scarcely had he brought his reflexions before the public, when a considerable number of discerning men, in most countries of Europe, who had been long dissatisfied with the dust and darkness of the schools, approved and embraced them, and wished to have *Des Cartes* recommended to the studious youth, and the Peripatetics set aside. On the other hand, the whole tribe of Peripatetics, aided by the theologians, who feared lest religion should suffer from some insidious blow, raised a terrible commotion, to prevent the new philosophy from supplanting the old; and to carry on the war with better success, they bitterly taxed the author of it, not only with the grossest errors, but also with downright atheism. This will appear the less surprising, if we consider, that the Aristotelians fought, not so much for their system of philosophy as for their own advantages, their honours and emoluments. The Theosophists, Rosicrucians, and Chemists seemed to enter the contest with more calmness; and yet there was not one of them who did not regard the doctrines of the Peripatetics, vain and injurious to piety as they were, as far more tolerable than the Cartesian discoveries.² The result of this long contest was, that the wiser part of Europe would not indeed give themselves up entirely to the philosophy of *Des Cartes* alone, yet, in conformity with his example, they resolved to philosophize more freely than before, and to renounce the slavery of *Aristotle*.

¹ Those who wish further information on this subject, may consult his *Institutiones Philosophiæ*: a diffuse performance, which fills the two first volumes of his works [published by Sorbierre, in 6 vols. fol. A.D. 1658]. Throughout these Institutes it seems to be his main object to show, that the opinions of the philosophers, both ancient and modern, on most subjects, de-

rived by them from the precepts of metaphysics, have little of certainty and solidity.

² Here should be read, besides the others who have written the history of *Des Cartes* and his philosophy, Hadrian Baillet's *Life of Des Cartes*, in French, printed at Paris, 1691, 2 vols. 4to. And the *Nouveau Dictionnaire Histor. et Crit.* iii. 39.

§ 33. The great men contemporary with *Des Cartes* very generally applauded his plan and purpose of philosophizing without subjecting himself to a guide or master, of proceeding circumspectly and slowly from the first dictates of nature and reason to things more complex and difficult, and of admitting nothing till it was well examined and understood. Nor was there an individual who did not acknowledge that he was the author of many brilliant and very useful discoveries and demonstrations. But some of them looked upon his positions respecting the causes and principles of natural things, as resting, for the most part, on mere conjecture; and considered the groundwork of his whole system, namely, his definitions or ideas of God, or the first cause, of matter and spirit, of the essential nature of things, of motion and its laws, and of other similar subjects, as either uncertain, or leading to dangerous errors, or contrary to experience. At the head of these was his countryman, *Peter Gassendi*; who had attempted to lower the credit of the Aristotelians and the Chemists before *Des Cartes*; and who was his equal in genius, much his superior in learning, and most expert in all branches of mathematics. He endeavoured to overthrow those metaphysical principles which *Des Cartes* had made the foundation of his whole system; and in opposition to his natural philosophy set up another, which was not unlike the old Epicurean, but far more perfect, better, and more solid, and founded on experience and the testimony of the senses.¹ The followers of this new and very sagacious teacher were not numerous, and were far outnumbered by the Cartesian host; yet it was a select band, and pre-eminent for attainments and ardour in mathematical and physical knowledge. Among his countrymen *Gassendi* had few admirers; but among their neighbours, the English, who at that time were much devoted to physical and mathematical studies, he had many more adherents. Even those English philosophers and theologians, who combated *Thomas Hobbes* (whose doctrines more resembled those of *Gassendi* than they did those of *Des Cartes*), and who, in order to confute him, revived the Platonic philosophy, such as *William [Benjamin] Whicohet*, *Theophilus Gale*, *Ralph Cudworth*, *Henry More*, and others, did not hesitate to associate *Plato* with *Gassendi*, and to put such a construction upon the latter, as to make him appear the friend of the former.²

§ 34. From this time onward, Christendom was divided by two distinguished sects of philosophers; who, though they had little dis-

¹ See, in particular, his *Disquisitio Metaphysica, seu Dubitationes et Instantiæ adversus Cartesii Metaphysicum et Responsa*; which was first published in 1641, and is inserted in the third volume of his works, p. 283, &c. A neat compendium of his whole system of philosophy, was drawn up by Francis Bernier, a celebrated French physician: *Abrégé de la Philosophie de Gassendi*, Lyons, 1684, 8 vols. 12mo. From this compendium, the views of this great man may be more easily learned than from his own

writings, which are not unfrequently designedly ambiguous and equivocal, and likewise overloaded with various learning. The Life of *Gassendi* was not long since carefully written by Bougerel, one of the Fathers of the Oratory, Paris, 1737, 12mo, concerning which, see *Biblioth. Française*, xxvii. 353, &c.

² See the remarks we have made, in the Preface to *Cudworth's Intellectual System*, g. 2. a. and in many places of our *Notes* to that work.

pute about things of most practical utility in human life, were much at variance respecting the starting-points in all philosophical reasonings, or the foundations of all human knowledge. The one may not improperly be called the *metaphysical* sect, and the other the *mathematical*; nor would the leaders in these schools probably reject these appellations. The former trod in the footsteps of *Des Cartes*; the latter preferred the method of *Gassendi*. *That* supposed, truth was to be discovered by reasoning; *this*, rather by experiments and observation. *That* placed little dependence on the senses, and trusted more to reflexion and ratiocination: *this* placed less dependence on reasoning, and relied more on the senses and the actual inspection of things. *That* deduced from the precepts of metaphysics a long list of dogmas: by which, it affirmed, a way was opened for acquiring a certain and precise knowledge of the nature of God, of souls, of bodies, and of the entire universe; *this* did not indeed reject the principles of metaphysics, but it denied their sufficiency for constructing an entire system of philosophy; and contended, on the contrary, that long experience, a careful inspection of things, and experiments often repeated, were the best helps to the attainment of solid and useful knowledge. *That* boldly soars aloft to examine the first cause and source of truth, and the natures and causes of all things; and returning with these discoveries, descends to explain by them the changes that take place in nature, the purposes and the attributes of God, the character and duties of men, and the constitution and fabric of the universe: *this*, more timid and more modest, first inspects, most attentively, the objects which meet the eye, and which lie as it were at our feet; and then ascends to inquiries into the nature and causes of things. *That* supposes very much to be perfectly well understood; and therefore is very ready to attempt reducing its knowledge into the form of a regular and complete system: *this* supposes innumerable things to elude our grasp; and instructs its followers to suspend all judgment on numberless points, until time and experience shall throw more light upon them; and lastly, it supposes that the business of making out complete *systems*, as they are called, either entirely exceeds the ability of mortals, or must be left to future generations, who shall have learned far more from experience than we have. This disagreement respecting the first principles of all human knowledge and science has produced much dissension respecting subjects of the greatest importance, such as the character of God, the nature of matter, the elementary principles of matter, the laws of motion, the mode of the divine government or providence, the constitution of the universe, the nature and mutual relations of souls and bodies: and the wise, who reflect upon the subject-matter of these disputes and the habits and dispositions of human minds, are fearful that these controversies will continue and be perpetual.¹ At the same time good men would be less troubled

¹ Voltaire published, a few years since: *sentimens de Newton et de Leibnitz*, Amsterd. 1740, 8vo: which little book, though not so

about these contests if the parties would show more moderation, and would not each arraign the other as chargeable with a grievous offence against God, and with subverting the foundations of all religion.¹

§ 35. All those who either embraced the sentiments of *Des Cartes*, or adopted his rules of philosophizing, endeavoured to elucidate, confirm, amend, and perfect the metaphysical method in philosophy. And these persons were very numerous in this century, especially in Holland and France. But, as some of this description, not obscurely, undermined religion and the belief of a God, of which class *Benedict de Spinoza* was the ringleader, and others of them abused the precepts of their master to pervert and overthrow certain doctrines of religion, as *e.g. Balthazar Becker*, the whole school, in various places, became extremely odious. There were none who pursued the metaphysical method more wisely, and at the same time more acutely, than *Francis Nicolas Malebranche* and *Godfrey William Leibnitz*; the former, a Frenchman, and one of the *Fathers of the Oratory*, a man equally eloquent and acute; the latter, a German, to be ranked with the first geniuses of any age.² Neither of them, indeed, received all the *dicta* of *Des Cartes*, but adopted his general method of philosophizing, added many opinions of his own, altered and improved many things, and confirmed others with more solid arguments. *Malebranche* yielded too much to his very fertile imagination; and therefore often inclined towards those who are agreeably deceived by

accurately written as it should be, nor a complete treatise on the subject, will yet be not a little serviceable to those who wish to know how much these philosophic schools disagree.

¹ It is well known, that *Des Cartes* and his followers, the metaphysical philosophers, were formerly accused by vast numbers, and they are still accused, of subverting all religion and piety. In the list of *Atheists unmasked*, by Jo. Harduin (*Œuvres mêlées*, p. 200, &c.), René des Cartes, with his principal and most noble followers, Antony le Grand and Silvanus Regis, hold a conspicuous place. Nor is the name of Franc. Nic. Malebranche, though many think him nearer allied to the fanatics, excluded from this black catalogue. (See p. 43.) It is true, that Harduin very often talks like one delirious; but he does not here follow his own genius, but adopts the views of the Peripatetic and Mathematical sects, who more fiercely than others assailed the Cartesian philosophy. And even very recently, Voltaire, though he is much more moderate, yet not obscurely assents to these accusations. (*Métaphysique de Newton*, cap. i. p. 3, &c.) Nor were the Metaphysical philosophers more temperate towards their adversaries. Long since, Antony Arnauld considered Gassendi, in his dispute against *Des Cartes*, as subverting the immortality of the soul. And Godfr. Wilh. Leibnitz added,

that the whole of natural religion was corrupted and shaken by him. See Maizeaux, *Recueil des diverses Pièces sur la Philosophie*, ii. 166. Nor does Leibnitz hesitate to declare, that Isaac Newton and his adherents, rob God of his best attributes and perfections, and rip up the foundations of natural religion. And most of the writings of both parties, quite down to our times, are full of such criminations.

² Concerning Malebranche, the author of the interesting work *Search after Truth*, [*Recherche de la Vérité*, Paris, 1673, 3 vols. 12mo, also translated into English, in 1 vol. fol. *Tr.*] and of other metaphysical works; see Fontenelle, *Eloges des Académiciens de l'Académie Royale des Sciences*, i. 317, &c. For what is reprehensible in his philosophy, see Jo. Harduin's *Atheists unmasked*, in his *Œuvres mêlées*, p. 43, &c. The life and doctrines of Leibnitz are described by the same Fontenelle, *l. c.* ii. 9. But his history, and his philosophy, are the most copiously described, by Charles Günther Ludovici, in his *History of the Leibnitian Philosophy*, written in German, 2 vols. Lips. 1737, 8vo. The genius of this great man may be the most satisfactorily learned, by reading his *Epistles*, published by Christ. Kortholt, in 3 vols. 8vo, Leipzig; and afterwards by others. Nor is it necessary I should here draw his portrait.

the visions of their own creation. *Leibnitz* depended entirely on his reason and judgment.

§ 36. The *mathematical* philosophy, already mentioned, had a much smaller number of followers and friends: the causes of which will readily occur to those disposed to inquire for them. But it found a new country affording it protection, namely, Great Britain; the philosophers of which, perceiving in its infantile and unfinished features a resemblance of the great *Francis Bacon*, lord Verulam, took it into their arms, cherished it, and to our times have given it fame. The whole Royal Society of London, which is almost the public school of the nation, approved of it; and, with no less expense than pains and patience, improved and extended it. In particular, it is indebted for its progress very much to those immortal men, *Isaac Barrow*, *John Wallis*, *John Locke*, and him who should have been named first, *Robert Boyle*, a very religious gentleman, much noted among other things for his very learned works. The theologians also of that country,—a class of men whom philosophers are wont to charge with violently opposing their measures,—deemed it not only sound and harmless, but likewise most useful to awaken and to cherish feelings of reverence for the Deity, and to support and defend religion, and most consonant with the decisions of the holy Scriptures and the primitive church. And hence, all those who publicly assailed the enemies of God and religion, in the Boyle lectures, descended into the arena clad in its armour, and wielding its weapons. But by the ingenuity and diligence of no one have its increase and progress been more aided than by those of *Isaac Newton*; a man of the highest excellence, and venerable even in the estimation of his opponents: for he spent the whole of his long life in digesting, correcting, amplifying, and demonstrating it, both by experiments and by computations; and with so much success, that out of a silver mass, he may be considered as having made a gold one.¹ The English say that the excellence and the superior value of this philosophy may be learned from this fact, that all those who have devoted themselves wholly to it, have left behind them bright examples of sanctity and solid piety; while, on the other hand, many of the metaphysical philosophers have been entirely estranged from God and his worship, and teachers and promoters of the greatest impiety.

§ 37. But although these two illustrious schools had deprived the ancient ones of their pupils and their reputation, yet all the philosophers would not join themselves to one or the other of them. For when men were again at liberty to judge and think for themselves, there were individuals of superior genius and acumen, and some also whose imaginations were stronger than their judgments, that ventured to point out new ways towards the latent seats of truth. But nearly

¹ This great man's *Elementa Philosophiæ Mathematicæ*, often printed, and his other writings, philosophical and mathematical, and also theological, are of great notoriety. His life and merits are elegantly described

by Fontenelle; *Eloges des Académiciens de l'Académie Royale des Sciences*, ii. 293—323. Add *Biblioth. Angloise*, t. xv. pt. ii. p. 545, and *Biblioth. Raisonnée*, t. vi. pt. ii. p. 478.

all of them failed of obtaining many followers; so that it will be sufficient just to glance at their object. There were some whose mediocrity of talents, or whose native indolence of character, deterred them from the difficult and laborious task of investigating truth by the efforts of their own minds, and who therefore attempted to collect, and to compact into a kind of system, the best and most satisfactory principles admitted by the schools. These are commonly denominated *Eclectics*. And finally, from these very disagreements and contests of the philosophers, some very acute men took occasion for despairing of finding the truth, and for opening again the long-closed school of the *Sceptics*. Among these, the more distinguished were *Francis Sanchez*, a physician of Toulouse,¹ *Francis de la Mothe le Vayer*,² *Peter Daniel Huet*, bishop of Avranches,³ and some others. It is common, and not altogether without reason, to place among this class *Peter Bayle*;⁴ who acquired high reputation in the latter part of this century by various works, rich in matter, and elegant in style.

¹ There is a celebrated work of his, entitled: *De eo quod nihil scitur*; which, with his other tracts, and his *Life*, was published at Toulouse, 1636, 4to. See Bayle's *Dictionnaire*, iii. 2530, and Peter de Villemandy's *Scepticismus debellatus*, cap. iv. p. 32.

² See Bayle's *Dictionnaire*, iv. 2780, &c. art. *Vayer*.

³ His book, on the Weakness of Human Reason, was published after his death, both in French, Amsterd. 1723, 8vo, and recently in Latin. But it appears, that, long before this book was either published or written, Huet had recommended the mode of philosophizing adopted by the sceptics; and thought this alone best suited to establish the Christian religion. See his *Commentarius de rebus ad eum pertinentibus*, lib. iv. p. 230, and his *Demonstratio Evangelica*, Preface, § iv. p. 9, where he approves the measures of those, who first enervate all philosophy, and expel it from the mind, by sceptical arguments, before they proceed to

the doubting of the truth of Christianity. We are aware that the Jesuits, to whom Huet was much inclined, formerly adopted with success, and do still adopt, this very hazardous artifice, in order to draw over Protestants to the Romish community.

⁴ Who, at this day, can be unacquainted with Bayle? His *Life*, copiously written, in two volumes, 8vo, by Peter des Maizeaux, was published at the Hague in 1732 [and is prefixed to the fifth edition of his *Dictionnaire Hist. et Critique*; Bâle, 1738, 4 tomes, fol.] His scepticism was most clearly shown, and confuted with great dexterity, by Jo. Peter de Crousaz, in a very copious French work [*Examen du Pyrrhonisme*]; a neat abridgment of which was made by Sam. Formey [*Le Triomphe de l'Evidence*], and translated from French into German, by Alb. Haller, Götting. 1756, 8vo. [See also Bayle's own answer to this and other charges brought against him, subjoined to the fifth edition of his *Dictionnaire*, iv. 616, &c. *Tr.*]

SECTION II.

THE PARTICULAR HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

PART I.

THE HISTORY OF THE ANCIENT CHURCHES.

CHAPTER I.

THE HISTORY OF THE ROMAN OR LATIN CHURCH.

§ 1. The sovereign pontiffs of this century — § 2. Solitude of the Roman church to oppress the Protestants — § 3. Commotions in Austria and Bohemia — § 4. The Bohemian war. Frederic V. defeated — § 5. Progress of the Bohemian German war — § 6. Gustavus Adolphus arrives. Termination of the thirty years' war — § 7. The peace of Westphalia — § 8. Injuries done to Protestants by the Romanists — § 9. The Moors driven out of Spain. Oppression of the Reformed in France — § 10. Attempts upon England fail — § 11. Milder measures of the Papists to overcome the Protestants — § 12. Theological conferences attempted — § 13. The popish pacificators — § 14. Pacificators on the side of the Protestants — § 15. The popish Methodists — § 16. Protestant apostates — § 17. Losses of the Roman church in the East — § 18. Authority of the pontiffs gradually diminished — § 19. Controversy of Paul V. with the Venetians — § 20. War with the Portuguese — § 21. Contests of the French with the pontiffs — § 22. Lewis XIV. in particular — § 23. State of the Romish clergy — § 24. The monks — § 25. The Congregation of St. Maur — § 26. Port-Royal. Reformed Bernardines of la Trappe — § 27. New sects of monks — § 28. The Jesuits — § 29. State of literature in the Roman church — § 30. Philosophy — § 31. Merits of the Jesuits, the Benedictines, the Fathers of the Oratory, and the Jansenists — § 32. The principal writers — § 33. The Romish religion corrupted still more — § 34. Morality subverted by the Jesuits — § 35. Condition of exegetic theology — § 36. Dogmatic, moral, and polemic theology — § 37. Contests of the Jesuits and Dominicans respecting the aids of grace, under Clement VIII. — § 38. Its continuation under Paul V. and its issue — § 39, 40. Commencement of the Jansenists — § 41. Arguments and measures of both parties — § 42. Five propositions condemned by Innocent X. — § 43. Bull of Alexander VII. against Jansen — § 44. Peace of Clement IX. Subsequent events — § 45. Austere piety of the Jansenists — § 46. The Convent of Port Royal — § 47. Controversy respecting the immaculate conception of St. Mary — § 48. Quietistic controversy. Molinos — § 49. His followers — § 50. Madame Guyon. Fénelon — § 51. La Peyrère, White, Sfondrati, and Borri — § 52. Canonisations.

§ 1. WHEN a new century began, the Latin church was governed by *Clement VIII.*,¹ called in earlier life *Allobrandini*, whose administration of the Roman commonwealth had already extended over several years. That he was able and astute, very eager to beat down

¹ [A.D. 1592—1605. *Tr.*]

the Protestants, and enlarge the Roman world, all admit: but whether he had as much prudence as the office of sovereign pontiff needs, many have thought not so clear.¹ He was succeeded,² in the year 1605, by *Leo XI.* of the Medicean family, who died, at an advanced age, in the very year of his elevation, and left the Roman chair to *Paul V.* of the family of Borghese,³ a man of violent passions, and frequently a most insolent assertor of his prerogatives; as appears, among other things, from his rash and not very successful contest with the Venetians.⁴ In *Gregory XV.*⁵ of the family of *Ludovisi*, who was elected in 1621, there was more moderation than in *Paul V.*, but no more gentleness towards those who forsook the Roman church. This, however, is the common and almost necessary fault of all the Roman pontiffs, who, without it, could scarcely fulfil the high duties of their office. *Urban VIII.*, one of the *Barberini*,⁶ whom the favour of the cardinals placed in the Roman chair in 1623, showed himself very favourable and liberal to learned and literary men, being himself well versed in literature, and an excellent writer both in prose and verse;⁷ but towards the *protestants* he was extremely cruel and harsh. Yet *Urban* will appear kind and good, if compared with *Innocent X.*⁸ of the family of *Pamphili*, who succeeded him in 1644. For he was ignorant of everything, of which the ignorance is least to be excused in heads of the church; and surrendered up himself, and all public affairs civil and sacred, to the control of *Olympia*, his kinswoman, a most vicious creature, avaricious, and insolent.⁹ His very zealous

¹ [He was born at Fano, in the beginning of 1536. His father, Salvestro Aldobrandini, was a doctor of laws at Florence, but of a distinguished family in that city. In politics he was a decided enemy to the Medici, and on their complete success, in 1531, he was compelled to leave his paternal city and seek a living elsewhere. Hippolytus, the future pope, was his youngest son. He proved worthy of the pontifical throne, both as a man of business, and an ecclesiastic from whom much was justly expected in the way of example. Every morning he said mass in person; every evening the illustrious Baronius received his confession; every noon, in the earlier years of his reign, twelve poor persons ate with him in one of his apartments. Ranke, *Fr. Transl.* iii. 290. *S.*]

² [During 27 days. *Tr.*]

³ [1605—1621. *Tr.*]

⁴ [Before his elevation to the pontificate, he had led a studious life, and came little before the world unless in employments of a legal character. He was thus unknown as a political partisan, and had fallen under none of those enmities which must be contracted by every such person. But an election; seemingly so little likely amid the strife of parties, surprised himself, and betrayed him into the weakness of considering it as an especial interposition of Providence. Thus regarding himself as an instrument divinely

raised up for some particular purpose, being of an intractable temper, and having an intellect trained in the strict observance of legal sanctions, he filled the papal chair with intolerable arrogance, harshness, and inflexibility. *Ibid.* 395. *S.*]

⁵ [1621—1623. *Tr.*]

⁶ [1623—1644. *Tr.*]

⁷ See Leo Allatius, *Apes Urbanæ*; which little book was published by Jo. Alb. Fabricius at Hamburg. It is a full catalogue of the learned and excellent men, who adorned Rome in the pontificate of Urban VIII. and who experienced the liberality of that pontiff. The neat and elegant Latin poems of this pontiff have been often printed. [These poems were written while he was a cardinal. Under him nepotism greatly prevailed; and the political transactions of his court are ascribable more to his nephews and family than to him. He procured a very distinguished edition of the Roman Breviary; suppressed the order of female Jesuits; conferred the title of *Eminence* on the cardinals, and on all cardinal-legates, the three clerical German electors, and the grand master of the order of Malta. *Schl.*]

⁸ [1644—1655. *Tr.*]

⁹ *Mémoires du Cardinal de Retz*, iii. 102, &c., last edition. Add vol. iv. p. 12. Respecting his contests with the French, see Bougeant's *Histoire de la Paix de Westphalie*,

efforts to prevent the peace of Westphalia, I do not think should be reckoned among his peculiar crimes; because, if I am not greatly mistaken, the best of pontiffs would have done the same. His successor, in 1655, *Alexander VII.*, previously called *Fabius Chigi*,¹ is deserving of a little more commendation. Still, he was not wanting in any one of the spots, which the pontiffs cannot wash out, if they would take sufficient care of their dignity. Besides, discerning and excellent men, even of the Roman church, have described him as possessing slender talents, inadequate to the management of great affairs, an insidious temper, and very dishonourable fickleness.² The two *Clements IX.* and *X.* who were elected, the one in 1667, and the other in 1670,³ performed little worth recording for posterity. The former was of the family of *Rospigliosi*, and the latter of that of *Altieri*.⁴ *Innocent XI.*, previously *Benedict Odeschalchi*, who ascended the papal throne in 1676,⁵ acquired a high and permanent reputation, by the strictness of his morals, his uniformity and consistency, his abhorrence of gross superstition, his zeal to purge religion of fables, and to reform the clergy, and by other virtues. His example, however, most clearly shows, that much may be attempted, but that little can be accomplished, by pontiffs who have sound views and upright intentions: likewise that the wisest regulations cannot long resist the machinations

iv. 56, &c. [Respecting Olympia, see *La Vie d'Olympe Maldachini, princesse Pamfili, trad. de l'Italien de l'Abbé Gualdi, avec des notes par M. I. Geneva* (or rather Paris), 1770, 12mo. The original was published in 1666, 12mo. Innocent, before his election, had lived in free commerce with Olympia: which was continued after his elevation, and was carried to such lengths, that the Donna, under the reign of her dear brother-in-law, possessed all power, sold all offices and prebends, gathered money in a thousand ways, opened the despatches of the envoys, and guided and controlled all state affairs. She suppressed near 2,000 minor cloisters, and thereby obtained vast sums: and other cloisters, threatened with the same fate, had to purchase their freedom. She was, for some time, excluded from the palace, and removed from the court, by cardinal Pancirolla, and his creature, the pretended cardinal Pamphili, whose proper name was Astalli, and who had no connexion with the pope. But she soon after returned to her old place, and was the absolute mistress of the Vatican, where she at last took up her residence: indeed, the unfriendly chroniclers say, that one of her ear-rings was found in the pope's bed. And such was the pontiff, who persuaded Ferdinand III. to hold the sword always drawn over the Protestants, who condemned Jansen, and who entered his dissent against the peace of Westphalia. *Schl.*]

¹ [A.D. 1655—1667. *Tr.*]

² See the *Mémoires du Card. de Retz*,

iv. 16, 77, who very sagaciously decides many points respecting him: also *Mémoires de M. Joly*, ii. 186, 210, 237, who speaks equally ill of Alexander: and the celebrated Arkenholz, *Mémoires de la Reine Christine*, ii. 125, &c. ['The craft and dissimulation attributed to this pontiff, really constituted an essential part of his character; but it is not strictly true, that he was a man of a mean genius, or unequal to great and difficult undertakings. He was a man of learning, and discovered very eminent abilities at the treaty of Münster, where he was sent in the character of nuncio. Some writers relate, that, while he was in Germany, he had formed the design of abjuring popery, and embracing the protestant religion; but was deterred from the execution of his purpose by the example of his cousin count Pompey, who was poisoned at Lyons, on his way to Germany, after he had abjured the Romish faith. These writers add, that Chigi was confirmed in his religion by his elevation to the cardinalship. See Bayle, *Nouvelles de la Répub. des Lettres*, Octob. 1688.' *Maol.*]

³ [1670—1676. *Tr.*]

⁴ *Mémoires de la Reine Christine*, ii. 126, 131. [Clement IX. was fond of peace and splendour, a foe to nepotism, and beneficent to his subjects. Clement X. was no less fond of peace; but introduced a peculiar kind of nepotism, by adopting as his son the cardinal Paolucci. *Schl.*]

⁵ [1676—1689. *Tr.*]

of such a multitude of persons, fostered and raised to power and influence, by licentiousness of morals, pious frauds, fables, errors, and worthless institutions.¹ At least, nearly all the praiseworthy regulations and enactments of *Innocent* fell to the ground and were overthrown, by the indolence and the yielding temper of *Alexander VIII.* of the *Ottoboni* family, who was created pope in the year 1689.² *Innocent XII.* of the family of *Pignatelli*, a good man, and possessed of fine talents, who succeeded *Alexander*, in the year 1691, wished to restore the regulations of *Innocent XI.* to their authority; and did partially restore them. But he, too, had to learn, that the wisest and most vigorous pontiffs are inadequate to cure the maladies of the court and church of Rome; nor did posterity long enjoy the benefits that he provided.³ Quite at the end of the century, 1700,⁴ *Clement XI.* of the family of *Albani*, was placed at the head of the Romish church. He was clearly the most learned of the cardinals, and not inferior to any of the preceding pontiffs in wisdom, mildness, and desire to reign well. Yet he was so far from strenuously opposing the inveterate maladies and the unseemly regulations of the Roman church, that, indiscreetly, and, as he supposed, for the glory and security of the church, *i.e.* of the head of the church, he rather ad-

¹ See the *Journal Universel*, i. 441, &c. vi. 306. The present pontiff, Benedict XIV., attempted, in 1743, to enrol *Innocent XI.* among the saints. But Lewis XV., king of France, influenced, it is said, by the Jesuits, resisted the measure; because Lewis XIV. had had much controversy with this pontiff; as we shall state hereafter. [It is a noticeable circumstance in his life, that in the thirty years' war, he served in Germany as a soldier; and there is still shown, at Wolfenbüttel, the house in which as an officer he is said to have resided. This circumstance, indeed, the count Turrezonico has called in question; in his work, *de Supposititiis Stipendiis Militaribus Bened. Odeschalci*, Como, 1742, folio. But Heumann has placed the fact beyond all doubt; in the *Hannöversich. nützlichen Sammlungen*, 1755, p. 1185; and in the *Beyträge von alten u. neuen Theologischen Sachen*, 1755, p. 882. He, however, afterwards assumed the sacred office; and even on the papal throne, exhibited all the virtues of a military commander, courage, strictness, and inflexibility of purpose. He sought to diminish the voluptuousness and splendid extravagance of his court, to correct all abuses among the clergy, and to extirpate nepotism. But he often went too far, and his reforming zeal frequently extended to things indifferent. For instance, he wished to prohibit the clergy from taking snuff, and the ladies from learning music; and the like. And in this way, he would have hindered the good effects of his zeal for reformation, if he had met with no obstructions to be

overcome. To canonisation, and to the reading of the bull in *Cæna Domini*, he was no friend. He actually canonised no one; and on Maundy Thursdays, on which this bull was to be read, he always gave out that he was sick. His life was written by Philip Bonamici, the papal secretary of the Latin Briefs, with design, probably, to favour his canonisation, in which business he was the Postulator: and it was entitled *Commentar. de Vita et Rebus gestis venerab. Servi Dei, Innocentii XI. Pont. Max.* Rome, 1776, 8vo. *Schl.*]

² [Alexander VIII. restored nepotism, condemned the Jesuitical error of philosophical sin, and benefited the Vatican library, by purchasing the library of queen Christina. *Schl.*]

³ [1691—1700. *Tr.*] Cardinal H. Noris says much respecting *Innocent XII.*, his election, character, and morals, in his *Epistles*; published in his Works, v. 362, 365, 370, 373. 380. [His hostility to nepotism, and his inflexibility, his strictness, and his frugality, were as great as those of *Innocent XI.* His strictness he manifested, in particular, by forbidding the clergy to wear wigs, and by requiring the monks to live according to their rules. He was so little disposed to burn heretics, that the Inquisition began to doubt his orthodoxy; and when he wished to protect Molinos, they by commissioners put this question to him, What did Aloysius Pignatelli believe? *Schl.*]

⁴ [A.D. 1701—1721. *Tr.*]

mitted many things, which conduce to its dishonour, and which show that even the better sort of pontiffs, through their zeal to preserve or to augment their dignity and honour, may easily fall into the greatest errors and faults.¹

§ 2. The pains taken by the Roman church to extend its power among the barbarous nations that were ignorant of Christianity, have been already noticed. We have, therefore, now, only to describe its care and efforts to recover its lost possessions, and to bring the protestants under subjection. And for this, its efforts were astonishingly great and various. In the struggle, it resorted to the power of genius, to arms and violence, to promises, to flatteries, to disputations, and to wiles and fallacies; but for the most part, with little success. In the first place, in order to demonstrate the justice of that war, which it had long been preparing to carry on by means of the house of Austria against the followers of the purer faith, it in part suffered, and in part caused, the peace settled with the protestants by *Charles V.* to be assailed by *Casper Scioppius*, a perfidious but learned man, by the Jesuits, *Adam Tanner*, *Anthony Possevin*, *Balthazar Hager*, *Thomas Hederick*, *Laurence Forer*, the jurists of Dillingen, and by others. For it wished people to believe, that this treaty of peace had no legitimate force; and that it was violated and rendered null, by the protestants themselves, because they had either corrupted or forsaken the Augsburg Confession.² This malicious charge was repelled, privately, by many Lutheran divines; and publicly, in 1628 and 1631, by order of *John George*, elector of Saxony, in two volumes, accurately drawn up by *Matthew Hoe*; which were called the *Lutherans' defence of the apple of their eye*,³ to indicate the importance of the subject. The assailants, however, did not retreat; but continued to dress up their bad cause in numerous books, written for the most part in an uncourteous and sarcastic style. And on the other hand, many of the Lutherans exposed their sophistry and injustice.

§ 3. The religious war, which the pontiffs had for a long time been projecting by means of the Austrians and Spaniards, commenced in the Austrian territories; where those who had renounced the Romish religion were, near the beginning of the century, oppressed in numberless ways by their adversaries, with impunity, and were divested of all their rights.⁴ Most of them had neither resolution nor

¹ There were published the last year [A.D. 1752], in French, two biographies of Clement XI.; the one composed by the celebrated Lafitau, bishop of Sisteron in France, *Vie de Clément XI.* Padua, 1752, 2 vols. 8vo; the other composed by Reboulet, chancellor of Avignon, *Histoire de Clément XI.* Avignon, 1752, 2 vols. 4to. Both (but especially the latter) are written with elegance; both contain many historical errors, which French historians are commonly not duly careful to avoid: both are not so much histories as panegyrics; yet such, that discerning readers can easily discover, that, though

very discreet, Clement, from a desire to confirm and exalt the pontifical majesty, did many things very imprudently, and by his own fault brought much vexation on himself.

² Respecting these writings, see, besides others, Christ. Aug. Salig's *Historie der Augst. Confession*, vol. i. b. iv. ch. iii. p. 768, &c. [See also Schlegel's notes to this paragraph. *Tr.*]

³ *Defensio pupille Evangelicæ.*

⁴ What occurred in Austria itself, is laboriously narrated by Bern. Raupach, in his *Austria Evangelica*, written in German.

ability to defend their cause, though guaranteed by the most solemn treaties and laws. The Bohemians alone, when they perceived it to be the fixed purpose of the adherents of the pope, to deprive them of all liberty of worshipping God according to the dictates of their consciences, though this was purchased with a prodigious expense of blood by their fathers, and but recently confirmed to them by royal charter, resolved to resist the enemies of their souls, with force and arms. Therefore, having entered into a league, they ventured courageously to avenge the wrongs done to them and to their religion. And that they sometimes went further than discretion, or the precepts of that religion which they defended, would justify, no one will deny. This boldness terrified their adversaries, but did not entirely dismay them. The Bohemians, therefore, in order to pluck up the very roots of their sufferings, when the emperor Matthias died in 1619, thought it their duty to elect for their sovereign one who was not a Roman catholic. This they thought themselves entitled to do, by the ancient privileges of the nation, which had been accustomed to elect its sovereigns by a free suffrage, and not to receive such as came in the common course of nature. In consequence, *Frederic V.*, the prince Elector Palatine, who professed the Reformed religion, was chosen, and solemnly crowned, this very year at Prague.¹

§ 4. But this step, from which the Bohemians anticipated security to their cause, brought ruin upon their new king; and upon themselves various calamities, among which was that most dreaded by them, the loss of a religion purged of the Romish corruptions. *Frederic*, being vanquished by the imperial forces at Prague, in the year 1620, lost not only the kingdom that he had occupied, but also his hereditary dominions; and now an exile, had to give up his very flourishing territories, together with his treasures, to be depopulated and plundered by the Austrians and Bavarians. Many of the Bohemians were punished with imprisonment, exile, confiscation of their property, and death: and the whole nation, from that time onward, was compelled to follow the religion of the conqueror, and to obey the decrees of the Roman pontiff. The Austrians would have obtained a much less easy victory, nay, would have been obliged at least to give better terms to the Bohemians, if they had not been aided and assisted by *John George I.*, the elector of Saxony; who was influenced both by his hatred of the Reformed religion, and by other motives of a political nature.² This overthrow of the elector Palatine was the commence-

The sufferings of the friends of a purer faith, in Styria, Moravia, and Carinthia, and the arts by which they were utterly suppressed, the same diligent and pious writer intended to have described, from published and unpublished documents; but death prevented him. [Something on the subject, as far as 1564, to which date Raupach had arrived when death overtook him, Dr. Winkler has left us, in his *Ancedota Hist. Eccles.* pt. viii. p. 233, &c. *Schl.*]

¹ Here, in addition to the writers of the

ecclesiastical history of this century, Andrew Caroli, and Jo. Wölg. Jaegerus, see Burch. Gotth. Struve's *Syntagma Histor. German.* p. 1487, 1510, 1523, 1538, &c. and the authors he cites. Add Mich. le Vassor, an accurate writer's *Histoire de Louis XIII.* iii. 223, &c.

² Here may be consulted, the *Commentarii de Bello Bohemico-Germanico ab anno Chr. 1617 ad ann. Chr. 1630*, 4to. Le Vassor's *Histoire de Louis XIII.* iii. 444, &c. Compare also, on many points of these affairs,

ment of the thirty years' war which occasioned so much misery to Germany. For some of the German princes entered into a league with the king of Denmark, and defended in war against the emperor the cause of the elector Palatine; who, they maintained, was unjustly deprived of his hereditary dominions. For they contended, that this prince, by invading Bohemia, had not injured the German emperor, but only the *house of Austria*; and that the emperor had no right to avenge the wrongs of that *house* by inflicting the penalties decreed against princes that should rebel against the Roman empire. But this war was not attended with success.¹

§ 5. The papists, therefore, being elated with the success of the emperor, were confident that the period most earnestly longed for had now arrived, when they could either destroy the whole mass of heretics, or bring them again under subjection to the church. The emperor, giving way too much to this impression, fearlessly carried his arms through a great part of Germany; and not only suffered his generals to harass with impunity those princes and states which manifested less docility than was agreeable to the Roman court, but also showed, by no doubtful indications, that the destruction of all Germanic liberty, civil and religious, was determined upon. And the fidelity of the elector of Saxony to the emperor, which he had abundantly evinced by his conduct towards the elector Palatine, and

Abraham Scultetus' *Narratio Apologetica de Curriculo Vitæ suæ*, p. 86, &c. It is a matter of notoriety that the Roman catholics, and particularly the Jesuit Martin Becan, induced Matthias Hoe, who was an Austrian by birth, and chaplain to the elector of Saxony, to make it appear to his master, that the cause of the Palatinate, as being that of the *Reformed* religion, was both unrighteous and injurious to the *Lutheran* religion; and to persuade him to espouse the cause of Austria. See the *Unschuld. Nachricht*. A.D. 1747, p. 358. [This Scultetus was the known court preacher to the unfortunate king of Bohemia; and he is said to have contributed much to his resolving to accept the Bohemian crown. Yet this last Scultetus denied; though he admitted that he subsequently commended the king for having taken that resolution, and in one of his sermons exhorted him to manly courage. Matthias Hoe of Hoeneg, of noble Austrian birth, burned with the most terrible religious hatred, and actually abhorred the Reformed, more than he did the Roman catholics. To be convinced of this, we need only to read his *Manifest Proofs, that the Calvinists harmonise with the Arians and the Turks*; or his *Thoughts respecting the Heilbron League of the Protestant States with Sweden*; which last piece is in the *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, xxxiv. 570—581. These traits in his character were known; and perhaps also the suscep-

tibility of his heart in respect to gold. And hence the Jesuitical emissaries, and particularly Becan, were able (by their unassuming and flattering letters, in which they represented the misfortune it would be, to have the Bohemians fall under the dominion of a Reformed prince) to give such a direction to his mind, that he exerted himself against the Reformed, and hindered his master from entering into a league with them. His master was attached to the Evangelical Lutheran faith, was very conscientious, and believed simply whatever his confessor said, *by whom* (as it is expressed in the above-cited *Thoughts*, &c.) *he inquired of the Lord*. The Austrian gold, at the same time, may also have had considerable influence on the court preacher's eloquence. At least it is openly stated, that the court preacher afterwards received 10,000 dollars, from the imperial court, to divest the elector of those scruples of conscience, which might cause him [to oppose] the peace of Prague, so injurious to the common cause. See Puffendorf, *Rerum Succicar*, lib. vii. p. 193. *Schl.*]

¹ [The principal historians of this war are Khevenhüller, *Annales Fernandi*; von Chemnitz, *Swedish War*; Puffendorf, *de Rebus Suecicis*; and the Histories of the thirty years' war, by Bougeant, Krause, Schiller, &c. See Henke's *Kirchengesch.* iii. 321, note. *Tr.*]

the disunion among the princes of Germany, encouraged the belief that the apparent obstructions to the accomplishment of this great object might be overcome with but moderate efforts. Hence in the year 1629, *Ferdinand II.*, to give some colour of justice to this religious war, issued that terrible decree, called, from its object, the *Restitution Edict*; by which the *Protestants* were commanded to deliver up and restore to the Roman church all ecclesiastical property which they had gotten into their hands since the religious peace established in the preceding century.¹ The Jesuits especially are said to have procured from the emperor this decree: and it is indeed ascertained, that this sect had proposed to claim a great part of the property demanded, as due to them in reward of their great services to the cause of religion; and hence arose a violent contest between them and the ancient possessors of that property.² The soldiers forthwith gave weight and authority to the imperial mandate wherever they had power; for, whatever the Romish monks and priests claimed as theirs,—and they set up false claims to many things, which by no right belonged to them,—the soldiers, without any investigation being had, wrested it at once from the possessors, often with intolerable ferocity; nor did they hesitate to treat innocent persons with various and most exquisite cruelty.

§ 6. Unhappy Germany amidst these commotions was in trepidation; nor did she see among her sons any one sufficiently powerful to resist the enemy now rushing upon her on every side; for the councils of her princes were exceedingly distracted, partly by religious considerations, partly by eagerness for personal aggrandisement, and partly by fear. But, very opportunely, *Gustavus Adolphus*, king of Sweden, the great hero of his age, whom even envy could celebrate after his death, came forward and opposed himself to the Austrian forces. At the instigation especially of the French, who were jealous of the growing power of Austria, he landed in Germany, in 1629, with a few forces; and in a short time, by his victories, destroyed in a great measure the very confident expectations, indulged by the emperor and the pope, of shortly triumphing over our religion. Their extinguished hopes seemed to revive again when this great assertor of German liberty fell victorious in the battle of Lützen.³ But time in some measure repaired this immense loss. The war therefore was protracted, to the great misfortune of Germany, amidst various vicissitudes, through many years; until the exhausted resources of the parties in it, and the inclinations of *Christina*, the daughter of *Gustavus* and queen of Sweden, who desired a peace, put an end to these evils and sufferings.

§ 7. After a violent conflict of thirty years, the celebrated peace,

¹ This subject will be found illustrated by the authors mentioned in Struve's *Synagma Histor. German.* p. 1553, &c. and by the others mentioned above. [See note, cent. xvi. sect. i. c. iv. § 8. *Tr.*]

² See Christ. Aug. Salig's *Historie der Augsb. Confession*, vol. i. book iv. ch. iii.

§ 25, p. 810, &c.

³ *Mémoires de la Reine Christine*, i. 7—20, where much is said of Gustavus, his achievements, and his death. The author of this book also illustrates, in various respects, the history of the peace.

called the peace of *Westphalia*, because it was concluded at Münster and Osnaburg, cities of Westphalia, in the year 1648, gave repose to exhausted Europe. It did not, indeed, procure for the *protestants* all the advantages and privileges which they wished for; because the emperor could not be induced, by any considerations, to reinstate perfectly the Bohemians and the Austrians in their former privileges, nor to restore the Upper Palatinate to its former sovereign; not to mention other difficulties of less moment, which it was necessary to leave untouched: still the peace procured much greater advantages to the adversaries of the Roman see than its patrons could well brook; and it established firmly the great interests of the Lutheran and Reformed churches. In the first place, the peace of Augsburg, which the Lutherans had obtained of *Charles V.* in the preceding century, was put in a position to defy machinations and stratagems of any sort: and moreover, the edict which required them to restore the ecclesiastical property of which they had gained possession since that peace, was annulled; and it was determined that each party should for ever possess all that was in its hands at the commencement of the year 1624. The advantages acquired by each of the protestant princes (and to many of them they were not inconsiderable), it would detain us too long to enumerate.¹ The Roman pontiff, in the mean time, clamoured loudly, and left no means untried to interrupt the pacification: but neither the emperor, nor any one who favoured his cause, was daring enough to venture again upon that perfidious sea on which they had with difficulty escaped shipwreck. The compact was therefore signed without delay; and all the stipulations made in Westphalia, were ratified and executed at Nuremberg in the year 1650.²

§ 8. After this period, the Roman pontiffs and their confederates did not venture to attack the professors of the Reformed religion by public war: for they found no opportunity to attempt so perilous a measure with any good prospects. But wherever it could be done without fear of the consequences, they exerted themselves to the utmost to abridge the protestants exceedingly of their rights, advantages, and privileges, though confirmed by oaths and the most sacred enactments. In Hungary, for instance, the citizens, who were pro-

¹ Whoever wishes for circumstantial information on this whole subject, will find abundant satisfaction, in the *Acta Pacis Westphaliæ, et executionis ejus Norimbergensis*; an immortal work of immense labour, compiled by Jo. Godf. von Meyern. As a shorter history, instead of all others, may be consulted, the work of Adam Adami, bishop of Hierapolis, entitled, *Relatio Historica de Pacificatione Osnabrugo-Monasteriensi*; which, improved and rendered more accurate than before, the illustrious author republished, Leips. 1737, 4to. Very elegant also, and composed for the most part from the documents of the French envoys, is the very

eloquent Jesuit Bougeant's *Histoire de la Paix de Westphalie*, Paris, 1746, 6 vols. 8vo. Nor is this Jesuit's history only neat and beautiful; it is also, in general, true and impartial.

² Innocent X. assailed this peace in a warm epistle, or *bull*, A.D. 1651. On this epistle there is extant a long and learned commentary of Jo. Hornbeck, entitled, *Examen Bullæ Papalis, qua P. Innocentius X. abrogare nititur pacem Germaniæ*, Utrecht, 1652, 4to. Perhaps the pontiff's epistle would have found the emperor and his associates ready to listen to it, if it had been backed by gold, to give it weight.

testants, both Lutheran and Reformed, were tormented with innumerable vexations, for ten years together, from 1671 to 1681.¹ Of the lesser evils, which they suffered both before and after this storm, from men of various classes, but especially from the Jesuits, there was neither measure nor end. In Poland, all that dissented from the Roman pontiff, experienced, to their very great sorrow and distress, nearly throughout the century, that no compact, limiting the church's power, was accounted sacred and inviolable at Rome. For they were deprived of their schools, and of very many of their churches; dispossessed of their property by various artifices; and often visited, though innocent, with the severest punishments.² The posterity of the Waldenses, living shut up in the valleys of Piedmont, were sometimes exposed to the severest sufferings, on account of their perseverance in maintaining the religion of their fathers; and especially in the years 1632, 1655, and 1685, when the Savoyards cruelly attacked that unhappy people with fire and sword.³ The infractions of the treaty of Westphalia, in many parts of Germany, and of the Germanic liberties secured by that treaty, in consequence of this preposterous zeal for the welfare and extension of the Roman church, were so many and so great, as to supply matter enough for large volumes.⁴ And so long as it shall remain the established belief at Rome, that God has given to the Roman church and to its head, dominion over the whole Christian world, there never will be reason for expecting that those can live in security and safety who renounce subjection to it; for they will always be looked upon as rebellious citizens, whom their legitimate sovereign has a right to punish according to his pleasure.

¹ See the *Historia Diplomatica de Statu Religionis Evangelicæ in Hungaria*, p. 69, &c. Paul Debrezenus, *Historia Ecclesiæ Reformate in Hungaria*, l. ii. p. 447, &c. Schellhorn, in the *Museum Helveticum*, viii. 46—90. [After some previous events in 1670, a conspiracy of some Hungarian nobles against the emperor, in 1671, gave opportunity for persecution. The noblemen were put to death, but at the same time, for three successive years, nearly all the evangelical churches were taken from them by force, and the Lutheran and Reformed ministers and schoolmasters, as participators in the conspiracy and insurrection, were summoned, part to Tirnau, and others to Presburg. When they appeared, a paper was presented them to sign, which was very injurious to their ecclesiastical rights. And as they refused to sign it, they were thrown into noisome prisons. From these, in 1675, many of them were condemned to the galleys, and sent to Naples; where, however, the intercession of the Dutch admiral, Ruyter, procured them freedom. The other prisoners, at the intercession of the republic of Holland, were also set at liberty. *Schl.*]

² See Adrian Regenvolscius, *Historia Eccles. Slavonia*, l. ii. c. xv. p. 216, 235, 253. What was undertaken against the Polish dissidents (as they were called), after the times of Regenvolscius [after A.D. 1652], may be learned from various writings published in our times. [See Jo. Erskine's *Sketches of Church Hist.* ii. 147, &c. *Tr.*]

³ See Peter Gilles' *Histoire Ecclesiastique des Eglises Vaudoises*, c. xlviii. &c. p. 339, Geneva, 1656, 4to, [also Jo. Leger's *Histoire des Eglises Vaudoises*, pt. ii. c. 6—20, and P. Boyer's *Abrégé de l'Histoire des Vaudois*, c. x—xxvi. p. 64—235, of the English translation, Lond. 1693. The dukes of Savoy and the kings of France made open war upon the unfortunate protestants, and actually expelled them the country, in 1686. Three years after, most of them returned; but whole congregations remained permanently in foreign lands, and particularly in the territory of Würtemberg. *Tr.*]

⁴ The Histories of religious grievances, by the learned Burch. Gotth. Struve and Christ. Godfr. Hoffmann, composed in Germany, are in everybody's hands.

§ 9. The faithful servants of the Roman pontiff, at length, in this century, completely purged both Spain and France of the last remains of heresy. In Spain, the descendants of the Moors or Saracens, who once held the sovereignty over a considerable part of that country, had long lived intermingled with the other citizens, and were considerably numerous. They were indeed Christians, at least in profession and outward behaviour, and industrious, useful to the country, and injurious to no one; but were not a little suspected of a secret inclination towards Mahomedism, the religion of their fathers. The clergy therefore did not cease to importune the king, till he had delivered the country from this pest, and expelled from his territories the whole multitude of Saracens, whose numbers were prodigious. By this measure the Spanish commonwealth, indeed, suffered a great loss, the sad effects of which are felt to the present time; but the church, which is far more important and excellent than the civil state, deemed herself so much the more benefited by it.¹ The *Reformed* in France, commonly called *Huguenots*, having been long borne down by various oppressions, and well-nigh destroyed, sometimes by crafty and concealed plots, and at other times by open and violent onsets, were at last most cruelly compelled, either secretly to flee their country, or to embrace, most reluctantly, and against their consciences, the Romish religion. This long persecution, than which a greater or more cruel has not occurred in modern times, will more suitably be explained in the history of the *Reformed* church.

§ 10. All the efforts, devices, and plans, which the boldest and most versatile geniuses could give birth to, were employed to bring Great Britain and Ireland again under the Romish yoke. But all these attempts failed of success. In the beginning of the century, some nefarious miscreants, burning with hatred of a religion which they regarded as new and false, having received encouragement from three Jesuits, of whom *Henry Garnet* was the chief, determined to destroy at a stroke the king, *James I.*, with his son and the whole English parliament, by means of gunpowder, which they had concealed under the house in which the parliament usually met.² For they had no doubts, if these could be destroyed, that means would be found for reinstating the old religion, and giving it its former ascendancy. The English call this horrid plot the *gunpowder plot*. But Divine Providence caused it to be wonderfully discovered, and frustrated, when it was ripe for execution.³ More gently and cautiously were things done during the reign of *Charles I.*, the son of *James*.

¹ Michael Geddes, *History of the Expulsion of the Moriscoes out of Spain*; in his *Miscellaneous Tracts*, i. 59, &c.

² [The three Jesuits were Garnet, Gerard, and Greenway. The first was provincial of the order. He was executed; the other two escaped. Probably, no one of the three could be fairly said to have advised this nefarious plot. They asserted themselves

to have strongly dissuaded from it: but they became cognisant of it, while it was in preparation, and did not reveal it. *S.*]

³ Rapin Thoyras, *Hist. d'Angleterre*, l. xviii. t. vii. p. 40, &c. John Henry Heidegger, *Historia Papatus*, period vii. p. 211, 291, &c. [Hume's *Hist. of England*, ch. xlv. vol. v. p. 60, &c. *Tr.*]

For the king being of a mild and gentle character, and apparently not far removed from Romish sentiments, having also a French wife who was devoted to the Romish worship, and being guided chiefly by the counsels of *William Laud*, archbishop of Canterbury, an honest man undoubtedly, and not unlearned, but heated with an immoderate love of Christian antiquity, a reconciliation between England and the Roman pontiff seemed likely to take place, but rather by means of caresses and promises, than through commotions and bloodshed.¹ But this expectation was frustrated by that lamentable civil war in which *Laud* as well as *Charles* were behaded, and *Oliver Cromwell*, a man of energy, foresight, and cunning, and one who dreaded even the shadow of the Romish religion, was placed at the head of the government, with the title of *Protector* of the commonwealth of England. But Romish hopes revived when *Charles II.* was raised to the throne of his father, to the immoderate joy of the people: revived also with increased confidence and satisfaction. For the king himself, as appears now from very abundant testimony,² had already been secretly initiated, during his exile, in the Romish worship; and his only brother, *James II.*, the heir of the crown, had openly apostatised from the religion of the English nation to that of Rome. But *Charles* was prevented from doing anything in favour of popery by his native indolence, extreme fondness for dissipation, and an indifference to all religion, tending to extreme impiety: and *James*, by his immoderate eagerness to consult the wishes of the Romanists, and to follow the rash counsels of the Jesuits, whom he kept about him, inflicted an incurable wound both upon the Romish religion and upon himself. For being created king after his brother's death, he supported in the most open manner, and therefore most injudiciously, the languishing cause of popery in England and Ireland; and to do this more effectually, he fearlessly trampled upon those rights and liberties of the nation which were held most sacred and precious. Exasperated by these measures of the king, the people of England, in the year

¹ See Urban Cerrì's *Etat présent de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 315, &c. Dan. Neal's *Hist. of the Puritans*, iii. 194, &c. [Those who would really study Abp. Laud's character, must not confine themselves to writers with a strong dissenting or republican bias. They must consult Heylin and Wharton, among elder authorities, or Lawson and Le Bas among moderns. From such sources they will find the archbishop to have resembled very imperfectly the portraits of him drawn by Neal, and other sectaries and republicans. Though deficient in tact, discernment, and pliability (exactly the qualities most pressing wanted during his primacy), he possessed other qualities really of more sterling value. His regard for ecclesiastical antiquity will naturally be estimated differently, according to the differences of opinion upon such matters that prevail in the Chris-

tian world. But some excuse is fairly due for a strong leaning to the side taken by him, on account of the extreme views taken by the side which was habitually in collision with him. *S.*]

² *Gilb. Burnet's History of his own Times*, vol. i. book iii. p. 603, &c. 606, &c. [and book i. p. 73, 74. *Tr.*] Dan. Neal's *History of the Puritans*, iv. 223, 237, 534. [ed. Boston, 1817, vol. iv. ch. iv. p. 255, &c. *Tr.*] Rapin Thoyras, *Hist. d'Angleterre*, l. xxiii. vol. ix. p. 160. [Hume's *Hist. of Engl.* ch. lxiii. vol. vi. p. 374, and especially ch. lxvi. vol. vii. p. 3, note; where it is proved, that Charles II. entered into a treaty with the king of France, in the close of the year 1669, or beginning of 1670, for the purpose of overthrowing the protestant religion in England, and establishing popery on its ruins. *Tr.*]

1688, invited over from Holland his son-in-law, *William*, prince of Orange; and *his* valour obliged his father-in-law to flee into France, an exile; and deprived the friends and promoters of the Romish religion of all hope of recovering England for their church.¹

§ 11. When the wiser patrons and promoters of the Romish cause perceived that little success attended violence and war, they concluded, that the reluctant minds of the protestants must be overcome by milder measures, and by covert artifices. But all of them were not disposed to adopt precisely the same course. Some resorted to public disputations between distinguished men of the two communities; indulging an expectation, which the numerous vain attempts of the preceding age could not but weaken, that in such colloquies, the more strenuous adversaries of the papal supremacy could either be vanquished, or at least softened. Others thought that contests should be avoided, and consultations rather should be held by the dissidents, in order to agree upon a compromise. Lastly, there were others who, believing that the former polemics on the side of the Roman church possessed vigour and spirit enough, but were deficient in *skill*, judged that new attacks should be made: and these found out new modes of reasoning against heretics.

§ 12. At the very commencement of the century, A.D. 1601, some distinguished Lutheran divines, by authority of *Maximilian* of Bavaria, and *Philip Lewis*, elector Palatine, disputed at Ratisbon, with three Jesuits of great fame, respecting the *rule of faith and practice*, and the *judge of religious controversies*; subjects which embrace nearly the whole controversy between the protestants and Roman catholics. In the year 1615, *Wolfgang William*, prince Palatine, who had apostatised to the Romish faith, brought about a rencounter at Neuburg, between *James Keller*, a Jesuit, and *James Heilbronner*, a Lutheran. In the year 1645, *Uladislaus*, king of Poland, called the more distinguished theologians, papists as well as Lutherans and Reformed, to a meeting at Thorn in Prussia, to deliberate amicably on the means of putting an end to the existing religious controversies: which design of the king procured for this discussion the name of the *Charitable Conference*.² A little after, in 1651, *Ernest*, landgrave of Hesse, in order to give a plausible air to that apostasy to the Romish camp, which he had before resolved on, ordered *Valerianus Magnus*, a celebrated divine of the Capuchin order, to hold a discussion, particularly with *Peter Haberkorn*, a divine of Giessen, in the castle of Rheinfels. Among the private disputes of this kind, the most noted of all was that

¹ These events are very accurately described by Gilbert Burnet and Rapin Thoyras; by the former, in the second volume of the *History of his own Times* (which has been translated from English, into both French and German), and by the latter, in his *Histoire d'Angleterre*, vol. x. Add Dan. Neal's *History of the Puritans*, vol. iv. ch. xi.

p. 536, &c. [And Hume's *Hist. of Eng.* vol. vii. ch. lxx. lxxi. Tr.]

² Colloquium charitativum. [The American translator has followed Maclaine in rendering these words; but, perhaps, a more correct version would be, *the friendly Conference*. S.]

of *John Claude*, a learned divine of the French Reformed church, with that very superior man of the papal church, *James Benign Bossuet*, in the year 1685. All these conferences had one and the same result. Neither party could convince the other; but each exasperated and alienated the other from itself, more than before.¹

§ 13. The whole art and method of those who attempted a *reconciliation* between the protestants and the papists, consisted in efforts to make it appear that the parties did not disagree so much as they supposed; and that there was not so much need of an argumentation [of the points at issue] as of a careful and perspicuous explanation of those doctrines of the Romish community which were offensive to their opponents, in order to remove entirely all controversy, and unite the minds of both in bonds of harmony. But in pursuing this general plan, they varied so much from each other, as to make it clear that they needed to come to some agreement among themselves, before there could be any ground for listening to the counsels and admonitions which they gave. The principal man among those who exerted their ingenuity in this way, was *Armand Richelieu*; that very powerful French minister of state, who spared neither promises, nor threatenings, nor arguments and persuasions, in order to bring the French Reformed Christians to unite with the papists.² The course pursued

¹ Whoever wishes for a fuller account of these conferences, may consult the writers mentioned by Caspar Sagittarius, *Introduct. in Historiam Eccles.* ii. 1569, 1581, 1592, 1598. Claude and Bossuet each wrote and published the history of the dispute between them. Bossuet's book is entitled: *Conférence avec M. Claude sur la matière de l'Eglise*. Paris, 1683, 12mo. In answer to this, Claude published his: *Réponse au Livre de M. de Meaux, intitulé Conférence avec M. Claude: à la Haye*, 1683, 8vo. [The conference at Ratisbon was between seven Lutheran and three Roman catholic divines, and occupied 14 sessions, ending Nov. 28th. Both parties, afterwards, published the *Acts* of this conference; which produced further controversy, each party accusing the other of misrepresentation. See Schmidt's Continuation of Sagittarius' *Introduction*, p. 1669, &c.—There was a conference appointed at Durlach, in 1612, by order of Geo. Frederic, margrave of Baden, and Francis, duke of Lorraine. The latter, at the request of the Jesuits, forbade the protestants to draw *inferences* from Scripture, and required them to cite only direct, categorical declarations of the Bible against the Roman catholics. These terms the protestant divines refused, and the conference ended. Its *Acts* were published, Strasburg, 1614, 4to.—The conference at Neuburg embraced but two sessions; as Heilbronn, by advice of his friends, refused to appear at the third. It related wholly to the correctness of the citations from the

fathers, in a book published by Heilbronn, entitled, *Uncatholic Popery*. Keller published his account of the conference, Ingolst. 1615, 4to, and Heilbronn his account, Ulm, 1616, 4to.—The conference at Thorn was occasioned by the Reformed preacher at Dantzic, Barthol. Nigrinus, who had become a Roman catholic, and persuaded the king, that such a conference would be attended by good consequences. But the result did not answer the expectations from it. The history of the conference, and of the subsequent written discussions, is given by Christ. Hartknoch, in *der Preussisch. Kirchen-historie*, vol. iv. ch. 6.—See Schlegel's note here. *Tr.*]

² Rich. Simon, *Lettres Choisies*, i. p. 31, 32, &c. new edit. Peter Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, t. i. art. *Amyraut*, note 1, p. 183, art. *Beaulieu*, note C, p. 484, t. ii. art. *Ferry*, note D, p. 1169, t. iii. art. *Milleterre*, p. 1982, and elsewhere. [To Moses Amyraut, an eminent French protestant divine and professor at Saumur, Richelieu commissioned a Jesuit, named Andebert, to offer a negotiation for a union of the Protestants and Catholics. The Jesuit stated, that, for the sake of peace, the king and his ministers were willing to give up the invocation of creatures, purgatory, and the merit of good works; that they would limit the power of the pope; and if the court of Rome would consent to it, they would create a patriarch; that the cup should be allowed to the laity; and that some other relaxations might be made. Amyraut mentioned the Eucharist.

by this illustrious man was followed, but with unequal steps, and with less influence, by the German Jesuit, *James Masenius*,¹ by *Adolphus Godfr. Volusius*, a divine of Mentz,² *Matth. Prætorius*, a Prussian,³ by *Aug. Gibbon de Burgh*, an Irishman, who was a professor at Erfurth,⁴ by *Henry Marcellus*, a Jesuit,⁵ and by some others of less fame. In later times, no one has entered upon such an attempt with greater caution and deliberation, than *James Benign Bossuet*, bishop of Meaux; a man of uncommon genius, and extraordinary prudence, whose *Exposition of the catholic faith* tends exclusively to show, that a short and easy way of return to the Romish religion would be open to the protestants, if they would only judge of its nature and principles, not according to the views entertained of it by their teachers, but as it really is.⁶ After him, *John Dez*, a Jesuit of Strasburg,

The Jesuit said; no change in that was proposed. Amyraut said; then nothing can be done. Here the conference, of four hours' length, terminated. See Bayle, l. c.—Beaulieu, a protestant professor of theology at Sedan, was suspected, but without grounds, of a willingness to sacrifice some doctrines, to produce a union. He had only maintained, that many of the disputes of theologians were about words rather than things. Yet it appears, that marshal Turenne sounded Beaulieu on the subject of a union. See Bayle, l. c.—Paul Ferry was an eloquent French protestant preacher at Metz. His enemies circulated the false report, that he was one of the protestant ministers whom cardinal Richelieu had persuaded to agree to a union of the protestant and Roman catholic churches. See Bayle, l. c.—Theoph. Brachet Sieur de la Milletierre was a protestant minister in France, who turned catholic in 1645, after being silenced for attempts to unite the protestant and catholic churches, on terms dishonourable to the former. He wrote and published much on the subject. See Bayle, l. c. *Tr.*]

¹ See Fred. Spanheim's *Stricturæ ad Bossueti Expositionem Fidei Catholicæ*; in his *Opp. Theol.* tom. iii. pt. ii. p. 1042.

² He published: *Aurora Pacis religiosa divinæ veritati amica*: Mentz, 1665, 4to.

³ In his *Tuba Pacis*; concerning which, see Peter Bayle's *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, A.D. 1686, p. 1309. [He was a Lutheran minister when he wrote the book; but he soon after became a catholic. *Schl.*]

⁴ In his *Luthero-Calvinismus schismaticus quidem, sed reconciliabilis*. [He was an Augustinian Eremit, who, after long wandering about, settled in Germany, and died at Erfurth, in 1676, as ex-provincial of his order, and professor of theology. *Schl.*]

⁵ The *Sapientia pacifica* of Marcellus was, by order of the duke of Gotha, confuted by Jo. Chr. Seldius.

⁶ Of this little book, and its fortunes,

very much might be said, not without profit. Among many others, see Christ. Matth. Pfaff, *Historia Literar. Theologiæ*, ii. 102. Jo. le Clerc, *Biblioth. Universelle et Histor.* xi. 438.—[It is remarkable, that nine years passed before this book could obtain the pope's approbation. Clement X. refused it positively. Nay, several Roman catholic priests were rigorously treated, and severely persecuted, for preaching the doctrine contained in the *Exposition* of Bossuet, which was, moreover, formally condemned by the university of Louvain, in 1685, and declared to be *scandalous* and *pernicious*. The Sorbonne also disavowed the doctrine contained in that book; though by a late edict we learn, that the fathers of that theological seminary have changed their opinion on that head, and thus given a new instance of the *variations* that reign in the Romish church, which boasts so much of its uniformity in doctrinal matters. The artifice that was employed in the composition of this book, and the tricks that were used in the suppression and alteration of the first edition that was given of it, have been detected with great sagacity and evidence by the learned and excellent archbishop Wake in the Introduction to his *Exposition of the Doctrines of the Church of England*, &c. See also his two Defences of that *Exposition*, in which the perfidious sophistry of Bossuet is unmasked and refuted in the most satisfactory manner. There was an excellent answer to Bossuet's book published by M. de la Bastide, one of the most eminent protestant ministers in France. This answer the French prelate took no notice of, during eight years; at the end of which he published an advertisement, in a new edition of his *Exposition*, which was designed to remove the objections of La Bastide. The latter replied in such a demonstrative and victorious manner, that the learned bishop, notwithstanding all his eloquence and art, was obliged to quit the field of controversy. See

undertook to demonstrate the same thing, though with less success, in a book in which he endeavours to prove that there is no disagreement, or but very little, between the council of Trent and the Augsburg Confession; than which, no two systems can be more unlike.¹ All these, and some others, undertook, upon their own responsibility alone, to remove the difficulties which prevented our ancestors from uniting with the pontiff: but *Christopher de Roxas*, bishop of Thina in Bosnia, came forward clothed with public authority, or at least professing to be so; and in the year 1686, and onwards, he visited the principal protestant courts in Germany, not only holding out the prospect of a new and more free council than that of Trent, but also giving assurance, that the pontiff would freely grant to his returning children, the protestants, whatever privileges and immunities they might demand, if they would only cease to decline the very mild government of the common father of Christians. But it was not difficult either for the theologians or for the more discerning statesmen to discover that this was only a snare; and that the Romish bishops aimed, not so much to bring about an honourable and stable peace, as to introduce again the ancient system of slavery.²

a very interesting account of this insidious work of Bossuet, and the controversies it occasioned, in the *Bibliothèque des Sciences*, published at the Hague, vol. xviii. p. 20. This account, which is curious, accurate, ample, and learned, was given partly on occasion of a new edition of the *Exposition*, printed at Paris in 1761, and accompanied with a Latin translation done by Fleury, and partly on occasion of Burigny's *Life of Bossuet*, published the same year, at Paris. *Macl.*—Bossuet's famous *Exposition*, which merely makes a thin pocket volume, was written some years before its publication, MS. copies of it having been taken so early as 1667. In the early part of 1671, 12 or 14 copies of it were printed for private circulation among persons whose opinions the author wished to have. Two or three of these copies never were returned, and one of them came into the possession of Abp. Wike. As this differs considerably from the work regularly published, as it was towards the close of 1671, great use has been made of the fact by Protestants. Bossuet evidently was inclined at first to give up points, or very nearly so, which his friends saw could not be treated in that way without shaking Romanism to its centre. As it is, he has left many things with very little defence, that require a good deal. He has gone upon the principle of defending nothing that cannot plead a sanction from the Council of Trent. This is a judicious line for an advocate to take, because he can thereby save himself trouble, and make the best of his cause; but it is ruinous to popular Romanism. Not only does it leave to shift

for themselves, innumerable absurdities and superstitions which popery provides for captivating the vulgar, but it also renders the foundations of many things, approved by well-informed Romanists, rather insecure. The book, however, though feared by the papal party at first, is now generally recommended to inquirers. It makes out a very plausible case, which may gain over cultivated minds, but its omissions do not shake the ignorant, because they do not read the book. *S.*]

¹ The book is entitled: *La Réunion des Protestants de Strasbourg à l'Eglise Romaine*; Strasb. 1689, 8vo. See Phil. Jac. Spener's *Theological Reflections* (in German), i. 95.

² See the collections in Jo. Wolfg. Jäger's *Historia Eccles. sæc. xvii.* and in Christ. Eberh. Weismann's *Historia Eccles. sæc. xvii.* p. 735. There are also extant other proposals for union, made known at the German courts in 1660, by the elector of Mentz, by order and authority (as it is said) of the Roman pontiff: and which Jo. Dan. Gruber has published, in the *Commercium Epistolicum Leibnitianum*, i. 411—415, 426, &c.—[Christopher Rojas (Roxas, Rohas, or Rorhas) de Spinola was a native Spaniard, and first came to Vienna in 1666, as confessor to the Infanta, Margaretha Theresa, the first wife of the emperor Leopold. In 1668 he was made bishop of Tina in Croatia; and in 1685, of Neustadt Wierisch, in Lower Austria. While bishop of Tina, his bishopric affording him little employment, he travelled about Germany, with the approbation of pope Innocent XI. as a negotiator with the protestants for

§ 14. These Romish peacemakers found among the protestants, especially among the Reformed, some divines, whose natural dislike of contention, or whose hope of obtaining fame and making their fortune, induced them to listen to these overtures, and to assert that the points in controversy between the two communities were not of such magnitude as to forbid all union. Among the French Reformed, *Louis le Blanc*, a man otherwise possessed of discernment, together with his disciples, fell under a suspicion of this fault.¹ It is more certain that *Theophilus Brachet*, *Milletierre*, and *Huisseaux*, a divine of Saumur, *Tanaquil Faber*, and some others, were chargeable with this conduct.² Among the English, *William Forbes*, especially, showed himself ready to compromise a great part of the controversies which separate us from the Romanists.³ Among the Dutch, no man of

their return to the church of Rome. The emperor Leopold also employed him in civil negotiations; and in 1691. empowered him to negotiate, with his protestant subjects in Hungary and Transylvania, a reconciliation with Rome. The terms he offered the protestants were, (I.) The suspension of the decrees of Trent; and the assembling a new council, in which the protestants and catholics should each have an equal number of voters, and the decisions of Trent undergo a new and impartial investigation. (II.) The acquittal of the protestants from the charge of heresy, provided they would cease to call the pope *Antichrist*. (III.) Communion in both kinds; marriage of priests; continuance in their possession of church property; abolition of auricular confession; and public worship in the vernacular tongue. In respect to the authority of the pope, and traditions, he did not express himself clearly. — The archbishop of Mentz, who had been active in promoting the peace of Westphalia, after sending an envoy to Rome, and consulting the electors of Treves and Cologne, held several meetings with the German Catholics, who were solicitous for the peace of the country at Mentz, Treves, Darmstadt, Rome, and elsewhere; and then made the following proposals to the protestants at Ratisbon. 1. That twelve Lutheran and twelve catholic divines should meet together, swear to act honestly and in good faith, without fraud or subterfuge, as they should answer it to God. 2. That they should examine the religious disputes, and decide them according to the Bible only. 3. That to enable them to agree, they should first make a new translation of the Bible. 4. That whatever a majority of them agree to, should be considered as valid articles of faith. 5. That both the decrees of the council of Trent and the Augsburg confession, should be examined, article by article, and judged of according to the Scriptures. As pre-

liminary articles, it was proposed to yield:

1. Worship in the German language. 2. Marriage of bishops and the secular clergy; but not of monks and nuns. 3. The abolition of auricular confession in Germany, and the other protestant countries; with the exception of Spain and Italy, where for certain reasons it was esteemed necessary. 4. Every one to be at liberty to pray to the saints or not. 5. Purgatory no longer to be an article of faith. 6. Communion in both kinds to be allowed. 7. The pope no longer to be regarded as universal judge, but only as the first priest and bishop of the church. Difficult questions of conscience may be laid before him: but none shall be compelled to follow his decisions. 8. Christians to be hereafter divided into two classes, the Ancient Catholics, and the Reformed Catholics, who should regard each other as brethren. Cardinals to be taken from both classes, and an equal number from each. — To these propositions, the Lutheran courts raised many objections; and the whole project was soon abandoned. See Schroeckh's *Kirchengesch. seit der Reform.* vii. 98, &c. and Schlegel's note here. *Tr.*]

¹ See Bayle's *Dictionnaire*, i. 484, &c. [art. *Beaulieu*. See also note ², p. 238. His whole name was Louis le Blanc, Sieur de Beaulieu. *Tr.*]

² Concerning Milletierre, see Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, iii. 1982, [and note 2, p. 238.] Concerning Huisseaux and his pacific propositions, see Rich. Simon, *Lettres Choïsies*, iii. 14, and Jac. Aymon, *Synodes Nationaux des Eglises Réformées en France*, ii. 765. [Jo. Quick's *Synodicon in Gallia Reformata*, ii. 544, &c. *Tr.*] On Faber's attempt, see Dan. Geo. Morhof, *Polyhistor*, i. 295.

³ His *Considerationes modestæ et pacificæ controversiarum de Justificatione, Purgatorio*, &c., were published, Lond. 1658, 8vo, and in Germany, with corrections, by Jo. Fabricius, a divine of Helmstadt. He is highly extolled by Jo. Ern. Grabe, in his notes to

information can well be ignorant how much *Hugo Grotius* was disposed to unite all sects of Christians together, and especially, to excuse and to give favourable views of the papists.¹ But these and the others (whom we omit to mention) obtained only this reward for their well-intended labours, that they offended both parties, and drew upon themselves a great weight of odium. To this class of divines, who burned with a preposterous zeal for union with the Romanists, many refer *George Calixtus*, a very learned professor in the university of Helmstadt; that is, the very man, than whom no one, perhaps, in this age, more learnedly and lucidly demonstrated the errors and defects of the papal church; and no one more uniformly affirmed that the decrees and the denunciations of the council of Trent destroyed all hope of healing the division. The reason why he was thought to lean towards this class, was that he used softer language than was customary respecting some controversies: and that he considered the first principles of the Christian religion as not absolutely subverted by the Romanists, but only loaded and deformed by a great multitude of intolerable opinions.

§ 15. This band of *pacificators*, which was badly marshalled, and weak from its own discords, was easily put to flight by a moderate effort: but stronger forces were necessary to withstand those among the papists who devised new modes of warfare. These have usually been called *Methodists*: and they were chiefly of that ingenious nation, the French; whom perpetual conflicts with the very learned *Huguenots* (as the protestants of France are called), rendered extremely fond of disputation, and also expert in it for that age. They may very conveniently be divided into two classes. The first class imposed hard and unreasonable laws of argumentation upon the protestants; and resembled those generals who concentrate their troops in fortresses, and surround them with ramparts, to enable them more easily to resist the assaults of their foes. Of this class was *Francis Veron*, a Jesuit, who considered the enemies of the Romish religion obliged to prove their doctrines, by explicit declarations of the holy Scriptures, and therefore preposterously denied them any *inferences*, necessary consequences, or argumentation;² *Barthold Nihusius*, an

Bull's *Harmonia Apostolica*, p. 19. Nor were his probity, and very exemplary life, unworthy of praise. Yet the wiser among the English cannot but admit, that he favoured the Romish party too much. See Gilbert Burnet's *History of his own Times*, i. 22. He was of course much commended by the papists. See Rich. Simon's *Lettres Choïsies*, t. iii. lettr. xviii. p. 119. He was, undoubtedly, one of those who did most to inspire the English (whether rightly or wrongly) with the opinion, that king Charles I. and William Laud had designs of again restoring the Romish religion in England.

¹ Here may be consulted with advantage though he is partial to Grotius, the author

of the book: *Grotii Manes ab iniquis obtrectatoribus Vindicati*, ii. 542. 826, &c.

² Jo. Musæus, de *Usu Principiorum Rationis in Controversiis Theologicis*, l. i. c. iv. p. 22. George Calixtus, *Digressio de Arte Nova*, p. 125, &c. Rich. Simon, *Lettres Choïsies*, i. 276. [The famous controversial preacher, Veron, who, under the protection of the French court, travelled about, challenging the Huguenots to public disputation and conference, from 1622, onward, composed a book with the Thrasonic title: *Methodus nova, facilis et solida, hæresin ex fundamento destruendi, et refutandi confessionem Gallicam, Augustanam, Saxonicam, libros denique omnes Theologorum Protestantium*, &c. Schl.]

apostate;¹ the brothers, named *Walenburg*, and others, who deeming it easier to defend their cause against attacks than to demonstrate its justice, threw the whole burden of proof on their adversaries, assuming the ground of mere respondents and defendants; *Armand Richelieu*, who recommended neglect of the various objections and complaints of adversaries, reducing the whole controversy to the single article of the church, and placing the divine majesty and authority of *that* beyond all cavils, by means of conclusive arguments; and some others.² The other class preferred the plan of those generals, who, to avoid a protracted war, resolve to stake all upon the issue of a general battle, instead of wasting time in sieges and a series of skirmishes; that is, they thought best not to weigh one point after another, and answer in detail all the arguments of opponents, but to overwhelm the protestants, at once, by certain great principles or general arguments, involving the whole subject, or by what are technically called *præjudicia*. The glory, if not of inventing, yet of perfecting this method, and of displaying it with great eloquence, is enjoyed by *Peter Nicole*, a Jansenist, who was neither a bad man, nor an obtuse reasoner.³ After him, many others thought so much power to lie in this method,

¹ Peter Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, iii. 2096, &c. [art. *Nihusius*.] This vain and half-learned man was formally confuted by Geo. Calixtus, in his *Digressio de Arte Nova, contra Nihusium*; a book very well worth reading; Helmst. 1634, 4to. [Nihusius was a Lutheran divine, educated under Calixtus at Helmstadt. But he turned Roman Catholic about 1614; after which he became an abbot and a bishop, and wrote numerous letters and tracts in support of popery. He died in 1657. His principal work was entitled: *Ars Nova dicto sacre Scripturæ unico lucrandi e Pontificiis plurimos in partes Lutheranorum, detecta nonnihil et suggesta Theologis Helmstetensibus, Georgio Calixto præsertim et Conrado Horneio*. Nihusius assumed that the church of Rome was an ancient church, and in possession of a system of doctrines which she had held unmolested for ages: of course she was not to be ousted of her possession by any new claimant, unless that claimant could make good his title. In this way, he threw all the burden of proof on the Protestants, or the innovators upon the established religion. At the same time, he forbade their reasoning from Scripture, and drawing inferences; and required them to bring direct and positive proofs. Reasonings, he said, were human; positive declarations of the Bible were divine. Moreover, in reasoning from the Bible, men differed so widely, that there was no knowing what to believe, unless we admitted, and confided in, an infallible interpreter, namely, the pope. When it was objected that the popes had, for centuries, been such dissolute and

base characters, that it could not be supposed they were the mouth of God to men, he replied, that the same might be said of some of the writers of the Bible, David, for instance, &c. See Bayle, *loc. cit.* Tr.]

² For a somewhat fuller account of these matters, see Frederic Spanheim, *Stricture ad Expositionem Fidei Bossueti*, in his *Opp.* t. iii. pt. ii. p. 1037. Jo. Henr. Heidegger, *Historia Papatus*, period vii. § cxxviii. p. 316. Jo. Geo. Walch, *Introduction to Religious Controversies*; written in German, ii. 191, &c. Christ. Eberh. Weismann, *Historia Eccles.* sæc. xvii. p. 726, and various others. [Peter and Adrian von Walenburg were two brothers, born at Rotterdam, who abandoned their country, and their religion, and lived at Cologne. The first was a titular bishop of Mysia, and suffragan to Cologne: the other was the titular bishop of Adrianople, and suffragan to Mentz. Their works, consisting chiefly of controversial pieces against the protestants, were printed together, under the title of *Fratrum Walenburgicorum Opera*, 1670, 2 vols. fol. *Schl.*]

³ He is generally supposed to be the author of that book, confuted by vast numbers, entitled: *Préjugés légitimes contre les Calvinistes*, Paris, 1671, 8vo, and afterwards reprinted several times.—[‘This method certainly was not the invention of Nicole, for it seems to differ little, if at all, from the method of cardinal Richelieu. We may observe, further, that Richelieu seems rather to belong to the second class of Methodists than to the first, where Dr. Mosheim has placed him.’ *Macl.*]

that they believe a single argument of this kind, if wisely and properly managed, sufficient to overthrow the whole cause of the protestants. Hence some opposed the protestants with the single principle of *prescription*: others considered our case as altogether desperate if it could be made to appear that the principal reformers were sensualists, and destitute of virtue: many had hopes of divesting their antagonists of all means of defence, on the ground that religious separation or *schism* is the greatest of all evils, if they made it appear that the fathers of the Reformed churches were the authors of so great a calamity.¹ Pre eminent among these, for the felicity of his genius, and the copiousness of his eloquence, but not for his discernment, was *James Benign Bossuet*, who endeavoured to demonstrate from the disagreements among the protestant doctors, and the frequent changes undergone by their institutions and doctrines, that the church established by *Luther* was not a true church; and from the perpetual uniformity of the Roman church, that it was the true church and of divine origin.² This appears very surprising in a learned man, who could not be ignorant of the remarkable subserviency that popes habitually display to individuals, times, and places; and still more in a Frenchman, whose fellow-citizens contend, with so much zeal, that modern Rome differs as much from ancient and primitive Rome as lead does from gold.

§ 16. So many and various efforts of the patrons of the Roman church, occasioned indeed the protestant doctors not a little labour, but produced very slender effects. Some of the princes, and a few learned men, were induced to embrace again the Romish religion, which their fathers had renounced: but no one nation or province could be persuaded to follow their example. Of the highest order of persons, *Christina*, queen of Sweden, a lady of great spirit and genius, but precipitate, and one who preferred her ease, pleasure, and liberty to all other considerations;³ *Wolfgang William*, count palatine of the Rhine;⁴ *Christian William*, marquis of Branden-

¹ Fred. Spanheim, *Diss. de Præscriptione in Rebus Fidei adversus Novos Methodistas*; in his *Opp.* t. iii. pt. ii. p. 1079.

² His *Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes*, Paris, 1688, 8vo, is very generally known. To this day, the papists value it very highly, and place it among their strongest bulwarks. And they may continue to exult in this their great champion and defender, if they choose; but if they are not beside themselves, and if they would preserve the head of their church safe, they must exceedingly desire that Bossuet's great principle, that *whatever church frequently modifies and changes its doctrines, has not the Holy Spirit*, may never be believed true, by one who is acquainted with the course of events at Rome. [Against Bossuet, James Basnage wrote his famous *Histoire des Eglises Réformées*; Rotterdam, 1690, 2 vols. 8vo.

And as Bossuet replied to this, in his *Défense de l'Histoire des Variations*, Basnage composed his great work, *Histoire de l'Eglise depuis J. C. jusqu'à présent*; Rotterd. 1699, 2 vols. fol. Schl.]

³ Of this queen, and the causes of her defection to the Roman church, there is a very full account in Arkenholz, *Mémoires de la Reine Christine*; which is a very interesting and useful book. [This vain and rash woman, who probably had no fixed religious principles, became weary of the cares of government; resigned her crown in 1654, and retired to Italy to enjoy the refined society of that country. As a preparatory step to a comfortable residence at Rome, while on her way thither, she changed her religion. Tr.]

⁴ [This prince, at his solemn renunciation of protestantism, in 1614, assigned as his reasons, the common arguments used

burg;¹ *Ernest*, prince of Hesse; ² *John Frederick*, duke of Brunswick;³ and *Frederick Augustus*, king of Poland,⁴ subjected themselves to the Roman pontiff. Of the men of genius and erudition, the illustrious *Jo. Christian*, baron of Boineburg, privy councillor to the elector of Mentz, and a noted Mæcenas in that age;⁵ *Christ. Ranzorius*, a knight of Holstein;⁶ *Cuspar Scioppius*;⁷ *Peter Bertius*;⁸ *Christopher Besoldus*;⁹ *Helfr. Ulr. Hunnius*;¹⁰ *Nic. Stenonius*, a celebrated Danish physician;¹¹ *Jo. Phil. Pfeiffer*, a professor at

by catholics to prove the truth of their religion, and the falsehood of the protestant. But it was believed at the time, and even by catholic historians, that a principal motive with him was, to secure the favour of the emperor and of the Spanish court, in order to make sure his heirship to the duchy of Juliers and Cleves. See Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch. seit der Reform.* iv. 370, and Schlegel's note here. *Tr.*]

¹ [At the capture of Magdeburg by the imperial troops, in 1630, he was taken prisoner, and carried to Vienna, where his conversion took place. The grounds of it, which he published, were chiefly that the protestants had no legitimate priesthood. See Schlegel's note here. *Tr.*]

² This very learned and good prince was converted in 1651, by the celebrated Capuchin monk, Valerius Magnus. See Gruber's *Commercium Epistol. Leibnitianum*, i. 27, 35. *Mémoires de la Reine Christine*, i. 216. But it is manifest from the writings of Ernest himself, that he, as well as Anth. Ulric, duke of Brunswick, and many others, did not go over to such a Roman church as actually exists, but to a very different one, which had long since ceased to be, and of which his imagination formed an idea.

³ [He put entire confidence in his favourite preacher, Henry Julius Blum; and when solicited to apostatise, refused, unless the catholics could first convert Blum. The Jesuits then applied themselves to Blum, and offered him an income of 2,000 dollars annually, if he would turn catholic. Blum consented. A dispute was held between them in presence of the duke.—For a considerable time Blum answered all the arguments of the Jesuits triumphantly; but at length they adduced a new argument, which Blum could not withstand, and which he told the duke, was unanswerable. Of course he now openly yielded to popery; and the duke followed his example. This was in 1654. Blum obtained his pension, and at length was made vice-president of the supreme court of appeals at Prague. See Schlegel's note here. *Tr.*]

⁴ [He was the elector of Saxony, and to qualify himself for the throne of Poland, made profession of the catholic religion in 1697. See Schroeckh's *Kirchengesch. seit*

der Reform. vii. 74, and Henke's *Kirchengesch.* iv. 559. *Tr.*]

⁵ He apostatised to the Roman church in 1653, following the example of Ernest, prince of Hesse; and was a man of great distinction, but rather a man of letters than a sound reasoner or philosopher. See Gruber's *Commercium Epistol. Leibnitianum*, containing his and Conring's *Epistles*, i. 35, 37, 39, 48, 56, 60, 70, 76, 93, &c.

⁶ See Jo. Möller's *Cimbria Literata*, i. 520. [He defended Lutheranism at Helmstadt in 1649. But the next year, at Rome, the splendour of the Jubilee, and the arguments of Lucas Holstenius, overcame him. See Henke, *Kirchengesch.* iv. 300, &c. *Tr.*]

⁷ [He was a German, learned, ardent, restless. He became a papist about A.D. 1600; fell out with the Jesuits; and fought much against the protestants. See Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, vol. iv. art. *Scioppius*. *Tr.*]

⁸ [Bertius was rector of the theological college of Leyden. Being an Arminian, he was censured by the Synod of Dort, and afterwards excommunicated. He retired to France, became a catholic, was a professor at Paris, historiographer to the king, and died in 1629. See Rees's *Cyclopædia*, article *Bertius*. *Tr.*]

⁹ [Besold was a learned and excellent man, professor of law at Tübingen, and after his conversion to the Roman church in 1635, professor at Ingolstadt. He published his motives; and appears to have been sincere; though the timidity of his character, and the troubled state of the times, seem to have had an influence. His revolt was a serious loss to the protestants. See Henke, *Kirchengesch.* iii. 517, and Schlegel's note here. *Tr.*]

¹⁰ [He was the son of the famous Ægidius Hunnius, and brother to Nicolas. He was professor of law at Giessen and Marburg, turned catholic in 1631, was made councillor and vice-chancellor at Treves, and died in 1636. See Henke and Schlegel, *l. c.* *Tr.*]

¹¹ [This celebrated anatomist travelled for improvement as far as Italy. On his return, he was made professor of anatomy at Copenhagen; but preferring Italy, he soon removed to that country. There, at the age of 37, in 1675, he became a Roman

Königsberg;¹ *Lucas Holstenius*,² with his kinsman, *Peter Lambecius*;³ *Henry Jul. Blum*, professor at Helmstadt, a learned but vain man;⁴ *Daniel Nessel*;⁵ *Andrew Fromm*;⁶ *Barthold Nihusius*, *Christ. Hellwig*, *Matth. Prætorius*;⁷ and some others of inferior note and standing, revolted to the Romish party. But if from these you except such as we are abundantly assured were led to this change by their domestic misfortunes, their desire to advance their rank and glory, their inordinate desire of wealth and worldly advantages, their fickleness of mind, their imbecility of intellect, and other causes of no better character, you will reduce the whole number to a few persons, whom no one will greatly envy the Roman catholics.⁸

§ 17. The Christians of the East, who were not of the Romish communion, opposed the papal envoys no less firmly than the Europeans. Nor do the more ingenuous catholics themselves deny that those who give us splendid accounts of the great extension of the papal authority among the Nestorians and Monophysites, and of the favourable disposition of several of the prelates of these sects towards the Roman church, deceive us with fictitious statements.⁹ On the

catholic, changed his profession, was created a titular bishop, and sent as papal legate into Germany, where he died in 1686. He was first a great anatomist, and then a very sincere catholic, and a man of blameless life. He wrote many tracts in defence of popery. See Jo. Möller's *Cimbria Literata*, ii. 867, &c. *Tr.*]

¹ [See Henke's *Kirchengesch.* iv. 305. He apostatised in 1694; published his apology for it; and died the next year. *Tr.*]

² [This distinguished literary man was born at Hamburg in 1596; first studied medicine, but afterwards devoted himself to Latin and Greek literature, and to ecclesiastical antiquities. He early travelled to Italy and Sicily. Returning, he pursued study in Holland. Being denied a scholarship at Leyden, he left that place in disgust, and after travelling a year or two, settled in Paris, A.D. 1624. Here he was promoted, became a catholic, and an author. He next went to Italy, where he was in high esteem; was made librarian to the pope, and came near to being a cardinal. He died 1661, aged 65. He was one of the most learned men of his age, and a sincere catholic, but not bigoted. See Jo. Möller's *Cimbria Literata*, i. 257, and iii. 321—342. *Tr.*]

³ [Lambecius was a countryman and nephew of Holstenius, and a rector at Hamburg. But he had a bad wife, and, besides, also fell into ill fame as a teacher of false doctrine. He therefore abandoned his country, office, wife, and religion, and became a librarian at Vienna. *Schl.*—This very learned man, and voluminous writer and editor, died in 1680, aged 52. See Jo.

Möller, *Cimbria Literata*, i. 323, and iii. 391—414. *Tr.*]

⁴ He apostatised in 1654. See Jac. Burchard's *Historia Biblioth. Augusta*, pt. iii. p. 223, 233. Gruber's *Commercium Epistol. Leibnitianum*, i. 41, 95, 135, 137, 379, 388, 410, &c. In these Epistles he is usually called Florus.

⁵ [He was the son of Martin Nessel, a rector of Bremen, and studied law. He and his father both turned catholics in 1667. Daniel succeeded Lambecius, as librarian at Vienna, and died A.D. 1700. See Henke's *Kirchengesch.* iv. 302. *Tr.*]

⁶ [He was a provost at Berlin, and from 1662 laboured much to unite the protestants and Roman catholics. His apostasy took place at Prague, in 1667. See Henke, *l. c.* iv. 303; and Schlegel's note here. *Tr.*]

⁷ [Concerning Nihusius, see above, § 15, note. Prætorius was noticed also, § 13, note. Hellwig was a physician, and son-in-law to J. P. Pfeiffer, mentioned in note (!), in this page. He apostatised with his father-in-law, A.D. 1694. *Tr.*]

⁸ Of these men, and others of a similar character, an account is given by Godfr. Arnold, *Kirchen- und Ketzehistorie*, pt. ii. book xvii. ch. iii. p. 912, &c. Weismann's *Historia Eccles. sæc. xvii.* p. 738. Walch's *Einleitung in die Religions-Streitigkeiten*, ii. 728, &c. [Henke's *Kirchengeschichte*, vol. iii. and iv.] With these may be joined the best writers on civil and literary history.

⁹ See the express declarations made by Jo. Chardin, in various parts of his travels. Add, respecting the Armenians, Urban Cerri, *Etat présent de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 170: also concerning the Copts, p. 216,

other hand, the sovereign pontiffs suffered two very severe losses in the East during this century; the one was in Japan, the other in Abyssinia. What occurred in Japan has already been stated among the evils which the Christian cause in general experienced. It remains, therefore, only to give account of the occurrences in Abyssinia or Ethiopia.—In the beginning of the century, the mission to the Abyssinians, which had been interrupted in the preceding century, was renewed by the Portuguese Jesuits with very favourable auspices. For the emperor *Susneius*, who assumed the name of *Seltam Segued* at his coronation, after his victories over his enemies, influenced partly by the eloquence of the Jesuits, and partly by the hope of confirming his authority by the aid of Portuguese troops, committed the direction of all religious affairs, in the year 1625, to *Alphonso Mendez*, a missionary from Portugal; or, in other words, created him *patriarch* of the nation. The next year, he not only himself publicly swore obedience to the authority of the Roman pontiff, but also required all his people to forsake the religion of their fathers, and to embrace that of Rome. But that new prelate, with his associates, by his ill-timed zeal, himself subverted the foundations of the papal authority, which appeared to be so well established. For, in the first place, he resolved to subdue the people, the greatest part of whom, together with their ministers, held their ancient religion more dear than life itself, by means of terror, wars, and very severe punishments, in the manner of the *Portuguese Inquisition*. In the next place, those who yielded obedience to the commands of the emperor, the prelate ordered to be baptized and consecrated anew, after the Roman form; as if they had previously been entirely without the true Christian ordinances; which was an injury to the religion of their fathers that the clergy regarded with more horror than they did the tortures and violence inflicted on recusants. And lastly, he did not hesitate to rend the commonwealth into factions, and to encroach even upon the authority and the prerogatives of the emperor. Hence arose, first, civil commotions and formidable insurrections; then the indignation of the emperor himself, and a general abhorrence of the Jesuits; and finally, a public edict of the emperor, in 1631, which gave the citizens full liberty to embrace which of the two religions they preferred. The son of Seltam, *Basilides*, who succeeded to the throne on the death of his father in 1632, thought proper to clear the country of these troublesome strangers; and therefore, in the year 1634, he drove *Mendez* and the whole body of Jesuits and Portuguese from Abyssinia, with no kind of indulgence or tenderness.¹

222, &c. That some small but poor congregations were collected among these sects, no one denies. Thus, near the middle of the century, the Capuchins collected a very small company of popish converts among the Asiatic Monophysites, whose prelate resides at Aleppo. See Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, ii. 1408.

¹ See Job Ludolf's *Historia Æthiopica*,

l. iii. c. xii. Mich. Geddes, *Church History of Ethiopia*, p. 233, &c. Matur. Veiss la Croze's *Histoire du Christianisme d'Ethiopie*, p. 79, &c. Jerome Lobo's *Voyage d'Abyssinie*, p. 116, 130, 144, and Henry le Grand's Additions to it, p. 173, and his fourth Dissertation, subjoined to vol. ii. p. 32. The judgment of this learned man respecting the Jesuit Mendez, in this *Diss.*

From this time onward, such an abhorrence of the Roman name became firmly rooted in the breasts of the Abyssinians, that they most cautiously guard their frontiers, lest some Jesuit or other priest of the Romish communion should creep into the country and again embroil their commonwealth. The Roman pontiffs at first sought to repair the damage done by the Jesuits by sending out two French Capuchin monks, and these being stoned to death by the Abyssinians as soon as they were discovered, recourse was had to more secret methods; and at last, the authority of *Lewis XIV.*, king of France, was resorted to, in order to open a door for the access of their missionaries to Ethiopia.¹ But, to the present time, they have not been able, so far as we know, to calm the wakeful indignation of that highly incensed nation.²

§ 18. We have thus far spoken of the external prosperity or adver-

iv. p. 36, is worth transcribing. 'Il eût été à souhaiter que le Patriarche ne se fut pas chargé de tant d'affaires (thus cautiously does he speak of Mendez's lust of power, and intrusion into the affairs of the civil government), et qu'il n'eût pas fait tant valoir son autorité, en se conduisant en Abyssinie, comme dans un pays d'Inquisition. Il révolta tout le monde, et rendit les Catholiques, et en particulier les Jésuites, si odieux, que la haine qu'on a conçue contre eux dure encore aujourd'hui.'—[The third Book of *La Croze's History*, which relates to the progress and ruin of this mission, is translated by Mr. Lockman into English, and inserted in *The Travels of the Jesuits*, i. 308, &c., as also is Poncet's *Voyage*, mentioned in the following note.]

¹ These projects are mentioned by Urban Cerri, *Etat présent de l'Eglise Romaine*, p. 217, &c. Henry le Grand, Supplement to Lobo's *Itinerarium Æthiopicum*, i. 181, &c. ii. 108, &c. [Father Lobo, who resided nine years in Ethiopia, has given an elegant and lively, though simple and succinct description of that vast empire, in his *Itinerarium Æthiopicum*. This *Itinerary* was translated into French by M. le Grand, and enriched by him with several curious anecdotes and dissertations. Hence Dr. Mosheim sometimes quotes the *Itinerarium*, under the title of *Voyage d'Abyssinie*, referring to le Grand's French translation of it.]—I would have the reader compare what this papist [le Grand], who was not unfriendly to the Jesuits, states, from documents that are above all dubitation, with the *Voyage* of the French physician, Charles James Poncet, who travelled into Ethiopia in 1698, in company with the Jesuit Brevedent, who died on the way; which *Voyage* was published by the Jesuits, in the fourth volume of the *Lettres curieuses et édifiantes des Missions étrangères*, Paris, 1713, 8vo. The discerning reader may thus

learn how much reliance is to be put on the statements which the Jesuits give us of the friendly disposition of the Asiatic and African Christians towards the see of Rome. After ingenuously and candidly making this comparison, he will perhaps declare that Grecian, and even Punic faith, is more to be trusted than that of the Jesuits.

² The biographers of Clement XI. and especially Lafitau and Reboulet, amuse us with fables, invented perhaps by the Jesuits and their friends, when they tell us of the Abyssinian emperor's embracing the Romish religion in 1712; or of his petitioning the Roman pontiff in 1703, to send him teachers to instruct him and his people. On the contrary, it is fully ascertained that but a few years ago, the Abyssinians most rigorously denied, not only to all Europeans, but also to the Turks, all access to their country: nay, they would not allow Egyptian Monophysites, who entered Ethiopia, to return again. This is confirmed by the best possible testimony in such a case, that of Benedict Maillet, who long filled the office of French consul in Egypt, and was appointed by Lewis XIV. ambassador to the emperor of Abyssinia: in his *Description de l'Egypte*, pt. i. p. 325, Paris, 1735, 4to. To him we add Henry le Grand, who, in his *Additions to Jerome Lobo's Itinerarium*, p. 222 (published in 1728), after faithfully detailing all the projects of the French and the popes in our age, for introducing Romish priests into Abyssinia, subjoins, that all such projects must necessarily appear vain and chimerical to persons acquainted with the state of things in Ethiopia: 'Toutes ces entreprises paroîtront chimériques à ceux qui connoissent l'Abyssinie et les Abyssins.' Perhaps the mission which is now fitting out at Rome to the Abyssinians will add new confirmation to this opinion.

sity of the Roman church, and of the zeal of the pontiffs to extend the limits of their empire: we now proceed to examine its internal state. The ancient form of government was in no respects changed: yet the officers of the church, in most countries, were abridged of no small part of their ancient power by the civil authorities. For that happy age was everywhere gone by, when the clergy might excite public commotions, engage in civil affairs at their pleasure, terrify with their sacred denunciations, and impose contributions and other burdens upon the citizens. The supreme pontiff himself, though saluted with the same appellations and titles as formerly, often experienced, with profound regret, that names had lost much of their ancient power and import, and were daily losing more and more. The principle formerly held only by the French, that the power of the Roman pontiff was wholly and exclusively confined to sacred and ecclesiastical affairs, and by no means extended to secular things, the property, the persons, and the business of the citizens, had now become well nigh the universal opinion of all kings and princes. The schools, indeed, in most parts of the Roman world, with the public writers, extolled the majesty of the pontiff to the utmost of their ability; and the Jesuits, who wished to be thought among the first defenders of the Roman see and power, did the same; and even the courts of princes sometimes used magnificent language respecting the dignity and authority of the head and father of the church. But the misfortune is, that even in cases like this, men commonly talk one way and act another; sovereign princes, accordingly, when any question or controversy arose with the court of Rome, measured the rights and prerogatives of the pontiff not as formerly, by the decisions of the schools, but by their own convenience and interests.

§ 19. This the sovereign pontiffs experienced, to their great detriment, as often as they ventured in this age to resume their former pretensions, and to encroach upon the jurisdictions of foreign states. In the year 1606, *Paul V.*, a haughty pontiff, laid the Venetians under an interdict; because they presumed to punish certain priests who had committed crimes, and forbade the erection of any more sacred edifices in their territories, without the consent of the senate, and prohibited all further transfers of estates to the clergy, without permission from the government. But the senate of Venice most firmly and vigorously resisted this wrong. For, first, it would not allow the priests to intermit the sacred services, as the pontiff had commanded; and the Jesuits and Capuchins, who chose to obey the pontiff rather than the senate, were banished the country. In the next place, they ordered *Paul Surpi*, a theologian of the republic, who was a monk of the order of *Servites*, a man of very great genius, and other persons deeply learned in civil and ecclesiastical law, to demonstrate the justice of their cause in several treatises, and to inquire with great freedom into the just limits of the papal power; which was done with so much force and ability, that *Cesar Baronius*, with other writers to whom the Roman pontiff trusted the defence of his cause, could with difficulty make head against them. When at

length *Paul V.* prepared for war against the Venetians, *Henry IV.*, king of France, interposed, and brought about a peace, but on terms that were not very honourable to the pontiff;¹ for the Venetians could not be induced to rescind entirely those decrees which had given offence to the Roman bishop, nor to allow the banished Jesuits to return to their country.² The senate of Venice, at that time, contemplated a secession from the Roman church: and the English and Dutch ambassadors endeavoured to persuade them to such a step. But many causes of great weight prevented the measure; nor did the sagacious and circumspect *Sarpi* himself, though he was no friend to the Roman court, appear to approve that step.³

§ 20. If the Portuguese had possessed as much wisdom and courage as the Venetians, equally unsuccessful would have been the contest which *Urban VIII.* waged with them in 1641, and which continued till the year 1666. The Portuguese, having driven out the Spaniards,

¹ Besides Thuanus (de Thou), and other historians, see Gabr. Daniel's *Histoire de France*, x. 358, &c. of the recent edit. Jo. Hen. Heidegger's *Historia Papatus*, period vii. § cxxx. p. 322, &c. Jo. Wolf. Jaeger's *Historia Eccles. sæcul. xvii. decenn. i.* p. 108. But especially the writings of the celebrated Paul Sarpi, and of the other Venetian theologians, deserve a careful perusal. For being written with no less solidity than erudition and elegance, these works contributed most to open the eyes of kings and magistrates, and lead them no longer to yield entire obedience to the will of the pontiffs, as had formerly been done. Pre-eminent among these writings, is the *Istoria delle Cose passate entre Paul V. et la Republ. di Venetia*, composed by Paul Sarpi, who is usually called Fra Paolo, i. e. Brother Paul; printed Mirandol. 1624, 4to, and the *Historia Interdicti Veneti*, by the same author; which was printed at Cambridge, 1626, 4to, by William Bedell, at that time chaplain to the English embassy at Venice, and afterwards a bishop in Ireland. Paul V., therefore, whose rashness and imprudence led the Venetians to publish these books, was himself the cause of those very great perplexities which the Roman see afterwards experienced from time to time.

² The Venetians, indeed, a long time after, in 1657, while Alexander VII. governed the Roman church, being wearied with the importunities of several princes, and especially Lewis XIV. king of France, suffered the Jesuits to return to their territories. Yet quite down to our age, nowhere is this very powerful society under more restraint than among the Venetians; to its own loss, it finds the old grudge remaining deeply fixed in the public mind. See the *Voyage Historique en Italie, Allemagne, Suisse*; (Amsterd. 1736, 4to.) i. 291. To this day,

the pontifical rescripts and *bulls* have just so much power among the Venetians, as the interests of the republic and the judgment of the senate will allow them to have. I adduce as a most credible witness, cardinal Henry Noris, who (in the *Epistles of famous Venetians*, i. 67) thus wrote, in 1676: 'Poche Bulle passavano quelle acque verso le parte del Adriatico, per le massime lasciate nel testamento di Fra-Paolo.' That is, 'Few bulls of the pontiffs pass the waters of the Po, and reach the shores of the Adriatic: they are prohibited by the maxims which Brother Paul laid down in his last testament.'

³ This project of the Venetians is expressly treated of by Gilbert Burnet, in his *Life of William Bedell*, p. 18, &c. of the French edit. and by Peter Francis le Courayer, *Défense de la nouvelle Traduction de l'Histoire du Concile de Trente*, p. 35, &c. Amsterd. 1742, 8vo, who shows very clearly that Sarpi departed indeed, in many respects, from the opinions of the Roman church; yet that he did not approve of all the doctrines of the protestants; nor would he recommend to the Venetians to separate from the Roman church. [From the account of the agent for a union, Jo. Bapt. Lenke, to the elector Palatine, which the keeper of the records, Gattler, has given in an appendix to the *Hist. of the Duchy of Würtemberg*, vol. vi. no. 10, p. 57, it appears that in 1609, a protestant congregation of more than 1,000 persons, among whom were about 300 gentry of the principal families, then existed at Venice; which brother Paul Sarpi and his friend Fulgenzo had collected, and which contemplated, under favourable circumstances, to abandon popery. The substance of this account is also in Le Bret's *Magazin zum Gebrauch der Staaten, und Kirchengesch.* ii. 235, &c. Schl.]

made *John*, duke of Braganza, their king. *Urban* and his successors pertinaciously refused either to acknowledge *John*, as king of Portugal, or to confirm the bishops appointed by him, though urged to it in a thousand ways both by the Portuguese and the French. The consequence was, that the greatest part of the Portuguese territories was for a long time without bishops. The vicar of Christ, who above all things should have no fear of man, had such a dread of Spanish resentment, that, rather than offend the king of Spain, he chose to violate his most sacred duty, and leave great numbers of churches without pastors. The king of Portugal was advised from various quarters, and especially by the French, to imitate the example of the Venetians; and to cause his bishops to be consecrated by a national council of Portugal, in despite of the pontiff: and he seemed, at times, disposed to act with vigour. But as well from the ascendancy of the Inquisition, as from the amazing superstition of the people, and their devotion to the will of the pontiff, he could not muster courage to adopt energetic measures. Wherefore it was not till after the lapse of twenty-five years, and the conclusion of a peace with the Spaniards, that *Clement IX.* confirmed the bishops appointed by the king. So far, however, did the Portuguese show themselves men, that they strenuously resisted the pontiff, when he endeavoured to make use of this contest as a means for extending his power in Portugal; nor would they suffer the ancient prerogative of their kings, to designate the bishops of the country, to be at all abridged.¹

§ 21. For many centuries there had been almost perpetual controversy between the French nation and the popes: which, as in other periods, so also in this century, sometimes came to an open rupture. If the pontiffs ever employed cunning and perseverance in any cause, they certainly did so, throughout this century, in their endeavours to subdue the feelings of the French, which were much opposed to the high claims of the papal power; and to destroy or gradually undermine what are called the *liberties of the Gallican church*: and the Jesuits were their principal coadjutors in this business. But to these machinations very strong opposition was made, both by the parliament of Paris, and by the very able writers, *Edmund Richer*, *John Launoy*, *Peter de Marca*, *Natalis Alexander*, *Lewis Ellies du Pin*, and others, who had the courage to bring forward the opinions of their fathers, some with more spirit and erudition, and others with less, and to confirm them with new arguments and authorities. The court, indeed, did not always reward these protectors of their country according to their merits; nay, frequently showed itself opposed to them, with a view to please the angry and menacing pontiff; yet this afforded little advantage to the papal cause. The French kings, it seems, would rather have their rights

¹ See Mich. Geddes, History of the pope's behaviour towards Portugal, from 1641 to 1666; which is in his *Miscellaneous Tracts*, ii. 73—186. The cause of the Portuguese in this contest, is learnedly defended,

among the French, by Ism. Boulliau, whose *Libelli duo, pro Ecclesiis Lusitanis, ad Clerum Gallicanum*, were reprinted at Helmsstadt, 1700, 4to.

silently maintained, than publicly defended with noise and war, in open declarations and disputations: nor did they esteem it below their dignity to temporise occasionally; and to pretend great reverence for the mandates and edicts of the pontiffs, in order more easily to obtain from them the objects of their wishes.¹ But if they perceived the Romish prelates taking advantage of this complaisance to extend their authority, they remembered that they were kings of the French, that is, of a nation for a long time most impatient of Romish servitude. This is abundantly confirmed by the contests of *Lewis XIV.* with the pontiffs.²

¹ [Voltaire, speaking of the manner in which the court of France maintains its prerogatives against the Roman pontiff, says, pleasantly, that *the king of France kisses the pope's feet, and ties up his hands.* *Macl.*]

² Many, both of the Lutherans and Reformed, and they men of great merit and learning, lament the augmentation of the Romish power in France during this century, and the gradual corruption of the minds of both the *noblesse* and the clergy, by the prevalence of Italian notions respecting the papal power, which the ancient French people viewed with abhorrence: and from this they infer, that the famous *liberties of the Gallican church* were much abridged in this century, by the influence, principally, of the Jesuits. Into these views they are led, partly by certain measures of the French monarchs, which have the appearance of greatly subverting the wishes of the pontiffs, and partly by the numberless declamations of the Jansenists, and other recent French writers, who lament that the ancient glory has departed from the French nation, that the edicts of the popes are held in immense veneration, that the Jesuits have imbued the minds of the monarchs, and of the leading men in the government, with excessive attachment to the Romish views, that vigilance is used against all those who wish to see the opinions of their ancestors prevail, that the tribunal of the *Inquisition* is gradually introduced, and other things of this sort. But I am persuaded that more reliance is placed on these representations than ought to be; and that the rights of the French people are still in the same state as formerly: nor am I able in any measure to discern those triumphs of the pontiffs over the French, which many excellent men, no less than Frenchmen generally, who are too indignant, especially the Jansenists and the *Appellants*, think they can clearly see. As the general policy of the French government is much more artful and crafty in the present age, so the machinations of the pontiffs are thwarted, in more silent and artful methods than in

the preceding more rude age. The same conflict is kept up as before; but it is now managed in a very different way. And this new and politic course does not meet the views of many of the French, who are of an ardent temperament, and who think they ought to contend in open manly warfare, in the manner of their fathers. Hence those sighs and lamentations over the rights of the nation invaded and almost annihilated by the craftiness of the Jesuits. If these persons could check those passions, with which Frenchmen are so prone to be agitated, and would carefully examine the history of their country, they would certainly learn that their liberties are not extinct; nor are they neglected by their monarchs, but are only maintained with more caution and foresight. France, I am aware, is full of persons who basely flatter the pontiffs, and seem inclined to become slaves for the sake of gain or of honours. But the number of such was no less, formerly, than it is now; as might be proved by numberless examples. Nor is it common for states to be ruled and governed by such characters. The Jesuits are in high authority; and they sometimes cause things to be done which cannot but be grievous to the friends of the ancient Gallic liberties: but things of this sort occurred also in those times when there were no Jesuits: and on the other hand, very many things occur, continually, which are most adverse to the wishes of the Jesuits, and which undoubtedly give much disquietude to the pontiffs. Those who contend learnedly for the opinions of their ancestors, sometimes scarcely escape without punishment: those who dispute with warmth, not unfrequently suffer for it, and are either imprisoned or sent into exile: and the most modest writers receive no reward for their labours. True; it is so. Yet the cause which these men defend, is not disapproved of, nor is it deserted; but *their* manner of supporting it is disliked. For the monarchs and their friends, in reality, choose to have the machinations of the pontiffs resisted, without noise and clamour, rather than by publications and

§ 22. The first of these occurred in the time of *Alexander VII.*, and originated from the temerity of the pontiff's Corsican guards; who, in the year 1662, ventured to insult the king's ambassador, the marquis de Créqui¹ and his lady, at the instigation, as it is reported, of *Alexander's* nephew. The French monarch was bent upon avenging this insult by a war: but the pope imploring his clemency, he granted him peace, in 1664, at Pisa, on the following conditions, among others: that he should send his nephew to Paris to ask pardon, and that he should brand the Corsican nation with infamy by a public edict, and inscribe upon a pillar in the Farnesian square, both the crime and its punishment, for the information of future generations. But this contest of the king was not so much with the pontiff, as head of the church, as with *Alexander*, considered as a prince and a temporal sovereign.² With the pontiff in his proper character the monarch had a controversy in 1678 and the following years, when *Innocent XI.* filled the Roman see. The subject of this controversy was the *right* which the French call the *Régale*; according to which, when a bishop dies, the king is allowed to collect and enjoy the revenues of the see, and in some respects to act in the place of bishop

disputation, which often produce parties in a nation, excite the passions of men, disturb the public peace, and exasperate the pontiffs, and alienate them from the French nation. At the same time, the public teachers are at full liberty to instil into their pupils the ancient principles of the nation, and to explain fully in the schools those views, by which the Romish lust of power has usually been for ages repressed. Some things take place which are inconsistent with these principles; and restraint is laid upon those who think it very hard to depart from the customs and practices of their fathers; yet this is almost never done, unless either necessity, or the prospect of some great advantage, warrants it. Besides, the public authorities take good care that the pontiffs shall derive no great benefit from such condescensions to them. That this was the fact, in the affair of the Bull *Unigenitus*, in which many things occurred not agreeing with the ancient customs and opinions of the French, will be readily seen by those who will examine carefully the whole transaction, and compare the public decisions with the actual state of the country. It was judged best, frequently to admit a less evil, in order to avoid a greater. In short, the kings of France are wont to treat the sovereign pontiff as the ancient heroes, who descended into the infernal regions, treated the dog Cerberus, that guarded the gate of that dark world, (no offence is intended by this comparison,) sometimes throwing him a cake, when he growled, and sometimes awing him with their brandished swords, as occasion and circum-

stances demanded; and both for the same object, namely, that they might freely march on in their chosen way.—These remarks I thought proper to extend thus far, lest those who read the bitter complaints and declamations of the Jansenists and *Appellants*, should put entire confidence in them; which many *Protestants* have done, and particularly those who are not well acquainted with the world.

¹ [He was *duke* of Créqui, having been so created in 1653 (Moreri). The pope, in this case, appears to have been the oppressed party. Créqui's domestics were extremely dissipated, and behaved at Rome with insupportable insolence, attacking the watch, and disturbing the whole city by riotous nocturnal frolics. Some of these disorderly young men having, upon one occasion, assaulted a detachment of the pope's guards, sword in hand, the whole *corps* thought itself insulted, and under instigation, as it was considered, of Marius Chigi, the pontiff's kinsman, repaired in arms to the ambassador's residence. The duchess of Créqui's carriage was then entering the court-yard, and into this the guards fired. In the tumult a page was killed, and several servants were wounded. Gifford's *Hist. Fr.* iv. 379. S.]

² See Jo. Wolfg. Jaeger's *Historia Eccles.* sæc. xvii. decenn. vii. lib. ii. cap. ii. p. 180, &c. Voltaire's *Siècle de Louis XIV.* i. 131, &c. The French also published some tracts, in which the history of this contest was related. *Mémoires de la Reine Christine*, tom. ii. p. 72, &c.

until a new prelate fills the place of the defunct. *Levis* wished to subject all the churches in his kingdom to this right; but *Innocent* pronounced this to be impossible, and would not consent to have this power pushed beyond the limits within which it had been formerly exercised. This contest was carried on with great passion on both sides. To the many admonitions and epistles of the pontiff the king opposed severe laws and mandates: and when the pope refused his approbation to the bishops appointed by the king, the latter, by his regal authority, caused them to be inducted into office: thus showing publicly that the Gallican church stood not in need of a pope. On the other hand, the high-spirited and persevering pontiff denounced the vengeance of Heaven against the king; and omitted nothing which might show that the pope's ancient power was not yet extinct.¹ The king, offended by this resolute behaviour, in the year 1682, assembled that famous convention of his bishops at Paris, in which the ancient opinions of the French respecting the power of the pontiff, as being exclusively spiritual, and inferior to that of councils, were stated in four propositions, adopted, confirmed, and set forth as the perpetual rule for all the clergy as well as for the schools.² But *Innocent*

¹ See Jo. Henry Heidegger's *Historia Papatus*, period vii. § cccxli. &c. p. 555. Voltaire, *Siècle de Louis XIV.* ii. 210, and numerous others, who either professedly, or incidentally, treat of the right of *Régale*, and the disputes that grew out of it. Henry Noris discusses very copiously the history of the origin and progress of this right, in his *Istoria delle Investiture Ecclesiastiche*, p. 547, &c. in his *Opp.* vol. v. [See also Gilbert Burnet, in his *History of the rights of Princes in the disposing of Ecclesiastical Benefices and Church lands, relating chiefly to the pretensions of the crown of France to the Régale, and the late contests with the court of Rome*; London, 1682, 8vo. *Tr.*]

² [This convention was composed of 8 archbishops, 26 bishops, and 38 other clergymen, who set their names to the four following propositions:

I. That God has given to St. Peter, and to his successors, the vicars of Christ, and to the church itself, power in spiritual things and things pertaining to salvation; but not power in civil and temporal things: Our Lord having said: 'My kingdom is not of this world;' and again: 'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's.' And therefore that injunction of the apostle stands firm: 'Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. There is no power but is from God; and the powers that be are ordained of God.' Therefore, in temporal things, kings and princes are subject to no ecclesiastical power of God's appointment;

neither can they, either directly or indirectly, be deposed by authority of the keys of the church; nor can their subjects be exempted from fidelity and obedience, nor be absolved from their oath of allegiance. And this principle, which is necessary to the public tranquillity, and no less useful to the church than to the state, ought by all means to be held fast, as being consonant to the word of God, to the tradition of the fathers, and to the example of the saints.

II. That plenary power in spiritual things so exists in the apostolic see, and in the successors of Peter, the vicars of Christ, that at the same time the decrees of the holy œcumenical council of Constance, approved by the apostolic see, and confirmed by the practice of the Roman pontiffs and of the whole church, and observed by the Gallican church with perpetual veneration, respecting the authority of general councils, as contained in the fourth and fifth sessions, must also be valid, and remain immoveable. Nor does the Gallican church approve of those who infringe upon the force of these decrees, as if they were of dubious authority, or not fully approved, or who pervert the words of the council, by referring them solely to a time of schism.

III. Hence, the exercise of the apostolic power is to be tempered by the canons, which the Spirit of God dictated, and which the reverence of the whole world has consecrated. The rules, customs, and regulations received by the Gallic realm and church, are also valid, and the terms of the fathers remain immoveable; and it concerns

received this blow also with manly courage.¹ Soon after, this violent contest was followed by another, when *Innocent*, in the year 1687, deprived the ambassadors resident at Rome, and among others the French ambassador, *Lavardin*, of the right of asylum; because it often rendered criminals secure of impunity. The king employed all the means that his angry feelings could suggest, to induce the pontiff to restore the right which he had taken away: but the latter met the king with an open front, and could by no means be persuaded even to put on the semblance of yielding.² This long conflict, which was injurious to both the parties, was at length closed by the death of *Innocent*. The subsequent pontiffs were more pliable, and therefore more ready to remove the principal causes of contention; yet they were not so careless as to forget the dignity of the Roman see. The right of asylum was abrogated with the consent of the king: the controversy respecting the *right of the Régale* was adjusted by a compromise.³ The four celebrated propositions respecting the power of the pontiff, without objection from the king, were yielded over by some bishops in private letters to the pope, but were by no means given up. To the present day they maintain their place among the laws of the realm.

§ 23. That the faults, which had long characterised the bishops and some of the inferior clergy in the Roman church, were rather increased than diminished, no good men even of the papal body will deny. The bishops everywhere owed their elevation, rarely to their piety and merit, but for the most part to personal friendships, to services rendered to individuals, to simony, to affinities and relationships,

the majesty of the apostolic see, that statutes and usages confirmed by the consent of so great a see and of such churches, should retain their appropriate validity.

IV. In questions of faith, likewise, the supreme pontiff has a principal part, and his decrees have reference to all and singular churches; yet his judgment is not incapable of correction, unless it have the assent of the church.

These propositions, approved by Lewis XIV. and registered by the Parliament of Paris, on the 23rd of March, 1682, were ordered to be publicly read and expounded in the schools from year to year, and to be subscribed to by all clergymen and professors in the universities. See Bossuet's *Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani*; the documents at the beginning of vol. i. *Tr.*]

¹ These four propositions, which were extremely adverse to his wishes, the pontiff caused to be opposed both publicly and privately. The most distinguished person who defended the cause of the pontiff was cardinal Celestine Sfondrati; who, under the assumed name of Eugene Lombard, published: *Regale Sacerdotium Romano Pontifici assertum, et quatuor propositionibus explicatum*, 1684, 4to. The form of

the types shows that the book was printed in Switzerland. Next to him in the multitude of Italians, Spaniards, and Germans, who supported the tottering majesty of the pontiff against the French, Nicholas du Bois, a doctor of Louvain, stood conspicuous. He published some books on the subject, which are mentioned by Bossuet. But all these were confuted by the very eloquent bishop of Meaux, Jac. Benign. Bossuet, in a learned work composed by order of the king, but which was not published till long after his death, entitled: *Defensio Declarationis celeberrimæ, quam de Potestate Ecclesiastica sanxit Clerus Gallicanus*, 19 Martii, 1682, Luxemburgi, 2 vols. 1730, 4to. For the king forbade the publication of the *Defence*, because, after the death of Innocent, there seemed to be a great prospect of peace; which in fact soon followed.

² See Jaeger, *l. c.* decenn. ix. p. 19, &c. The *Legatio Lavardini*, which was published 1688, 12mo. But especially *Mémoires de la Reine Christine*, ii. 248, &c.: for Christina engaged in this contest, and took sides with the king of France.

³ See Claude Fleury, *Institutio Juris Eccles. Gallici*, p. 454, &c. of the Latin translation.

and often even to their vices. And the greater part of them lived as if they had been hired with their great salaries expressly to exhibit before the people examples of those very vices which the Christian religion condemns.¹ If there were some (and that there were, I do not deny) who endeavoured to benefit their flocks, and who set themselves against both ignorance and wickedness, they were either put down by the enmity and hatred of the others, or at least fell under neglect, and were hindered from effecting anything great and laudable. And nearly the same things were experienced by those clergymen of inferior rank who exerted all their powers in behalf of truth and piety. These, however, if compared with those whom voluptuousness, ambition, and lust for wealth drove headlong, were exceedingly few. Some indeed of the pontiffs of this century should not be defrauded of their just praise for attempting to correct the morals of the clergy by wholesome laws, and to bring them to exhibit at least common decency in their lives. Yet it is strange that those very discerning prelates should not see that the very constitution of the Roman church and its whole interior structure, were insuperable obstacles to all such good designs; and that a pontiff, even if he were inspired, unless he also possessed more than human power, and could be present in many places at the same time, could never reduce such a heterogeneous mass of people to good order.

§ 24. The monks, though in many places they lived more decently and circumspectly than formerly, yet for the most part neglected extremely the rules and regulations of the founders of their orders. In the beginning of the century, as good and learned monks themselves admit, the state of all the monasteries was still lamentable. But as the century advanced, some wise men, first among the Benedictines in France, and then also in other countries, endeavoured to reform certain monasteries; that is, to bring them back in some degree to the rules and laws of their order.² Their example was afterwards followed by other religious houses of the Cluniacensians, Cistercians, Regular Canons, Dominicans, and Franciscans.³ At this time, there-

¹ See a multitude of proofs, collected from the most celebrated doctors of the Roman church, in the *Mémoires de Port-royal*, ii. 308.

² Le Bœuf, *Mémoires sur l'Hist. d'Auxerre*, ii. 513, &c., where there is an account of the first Reforms of this century. *Voyage Littéraire de Deux Bénédictins*, pt. ii. p. 97, &c.

³ There is an account of all the convents, both Benedictines and others, which submitted to a reform of any kind, in Hipp. Helyot's *Hist. des Ordres*, t. v. vi. vii. &c. To whose account, however, numerous additions might be made. Of the Reformed congregation of Clugni, which commenced in 1621, the Benedictines have treated expressly, in their *Gallia Christiana*, vii. 544, &c. They also treat of the Reformed Canons Regular of St. Augustine, vii. 778, 787, 790. For an

account of the Reformed Cistercians, in France and Germany, see Jo. Mabillon, *Annal. Benedictin.* vi. 121, &c. *Voyage Littéraire de Deux Bénédictins*, i. 7, 8, ii. 133, 229, 269, 303. The Reformed Cistercians, with great zeal, attempted a reformation of their whole sect, in this century; but in vain. See Meaupou, *Vie de l'Abbé de la Trappe*, i. 192, &c. I omit other notices as requiring too much room.—[I find no more suitable place to notice some abolished orders in this century. Clement XIV. in his Bull for suppressing the order of Jesuits, mentions the congregation of the Reformed Conventual Brethren, which Sixtus V. approved, but which Urban VIII. abolished by his Bull of Feb. 6, 1626, 'because the above-named brethren did not yield spiritual fruits to the church of God; nay, very many disagreements had risen between

fore, the monks of the Roman church became divided into two classes; namely, the *Reformed*, who, abandoning their licentious and profligate manners, lived more decently, and more conformably to the rules of their order; and the *Unreformed*, who disregarded the precepts of their founders, and chose to live as they found it convenient and pleasant, rather than austere, and according to the laws by which they were bound. But the number of the *Unreformed* far exceeds that of the *Reformed*: and moreover, most of the *Reformed* not only depart widely from the mode of living prescribed by their rule, but are also, in one place and another, gradually relapsing into their former negligence.

§ 25. Among the *Reformed* monastic associations, certain *Congregations* of Benedictines surpass the others, partly in the beauty and excellence of their regulations, and partly in the constancy with which they observe their rules. The most famous of these is the French *Congregation of St. Maur*,¹ which was formed under the authority of *Gregory XV.* in 1621, and endowed with various privileges and rights by *Urban VIII.* in 1627. This association does not indeed consist of genuine followers of *St. Benedict*, nor is it free from everything that can reasonably be censured; yet it has many excellences which raise it above all others. Of these excellences the first and most useful is, that it devotes a certain number of persons of superior genius to the cultivation of learning, both sacred and civil, and particularly to the study of history and antiquities; and that it furnishes them abundantly with all the helps they need to prosecute their business with advantage.² Those who are acquainted

those Reformed conventual Brethren, and the Unreformed conventual Brethren: and he allowed them to go over to the Capuchin Brethren of St. Francis, or the Observant Franciscans. According to the same Bull, the order of Regulars of St. Ambrose and St. Barnabas ad Nemus, was suppressed by the same pontiff. And in 1668, Clement IX. abolished the three regular orders of Canons Regular of St. Gregory in Alga, of Hieronymists de Fesulis, and of Jesuates, established by St. Jo. Columbanus; 'because they were of little or no use to the church, and had lent their revenues to the Venetian republic, to be applied to war against the Turks.' *Schl.*]

¹ See the *Gallia Christiana*; not the old work of this name, but the new and elegant production of the Benedictines of this same Congregation of St. Maur; vol. vii. p. 474, &c. Hipp. Helyot's *Hist. des Ordres*, t. vi. c. xxxvii. p. 256. The Bull of Gregory XV. approving the society of St. Maur, is severely criticised in all its parts by Jo. Launoi, that scourge of the monks, even the best of them, in his *Examen Privilegii S. Germani*; *Opp.* t. iii. pt. i. p. 303. He also treats of the dissensions and commotions in this order soon after its institution (though

with considerable prejudice, as is usual for him when speaking of monks), in his *Assertio Inquisit. in Privileg. S. Medardi*, pt. i. cap. lxxvi. in his *Opp.* t. iii. pt. ii. p. 227. [This Congregation consists of more than 180 Abbeys and Conventual Priors, which are divided into six provinces (extending over the greatest part of France); and it is governed by a general, two assistants, and six visitors, who are elected, as are the superiors of the several cloisters, every three years, in a general chapter of the order. As it is the object of this Congregation to revive the spirit of St. Benedict in the observance of his rule, special care is taken to train up the young religious according to it. Hence, in each province, one or two houses for novices are erected, from which those to be admitted to profession are removed to other cloisters, where they are trained for two years, to virtue and to acts and exercises of worship. After this, they study human learning and theology five years; and then spend one year in collecting their thoughts, and thus prepare themselves for orders, and for more assiduity in their spiritual offices. In some cloisters there are also schools. *Schl.*]

² The Benedictines talk largely of the

with the history of learning need not be informed how much this institution has benefited the literary world, or what a multitude of excellent and immortal works it has produced, for illustrating every branch of learning except philosophy.¹

§ 26. But the best and most sacred of these changes were esteemed trivial and imperfect by those whose eye was fixed on the ancient discipline, and who wished to see the lives of monks strictly conformed to their first rules. The number of these in the Roman church was not inconsiderable; though they had little influence, and were odious to most people on account of their severity. The reforming party thought that a monk should spend his whole life in prayers, tears, contemplation, sacred reading, and manual labour; and that whatever else might occupy him, however useful and excellent in itself, was inconsistent with his vocation, and therefore vain, and not acceptable

great services done by this Congregation in various ways; and among other difficult enterprises, they mention numerous cloisters of monks, which had collapsed and become corrupt, recovered and restored to order and respectability. See *Voyage de Deux Religieux Bénédictins de la Congrég. de St. Maur*, i. 16, ii. 47, and nearly throughout that work. And a person must be much prejudiced, who can look upon all these statements as fictions. There are, however, in the Roman community, persons who, for various reasons, dislike this society. First, some of the bishops are unfriendly to these learned Benedictines. For after these monks had thrown great light upon ancient history and upon diplomatics, by their learned works, they were able to defend their possessions, property, and rights, more learnedly and successfully in the courts, against the bishops who coveted them, than when they were destitute of this literature and erudition. In the next place, the Jesuits, whose merits and glory were greatly obscured by the splendid works undertaken and accomplished by these Benedictines, endeavour, to the utmost of their power, to run down both them and their pursuits. See Rich. Simon's *Lettres Choiesies*, iv. 36, 45. Others are led by superstition to indulge hatred of them; but it is, perhaps, a superstition tinged with envy. For these Benedictines have substituted the pursuit of learning, in place of that manual labour, which the rule of St. Benedict prescribes for his monks. The more robust are required to labour with their hands during certain hours of the day; but the more feeble, or such as possess superior genius, are taxed with intellectual or mental labour, or the pursuit of sacred and secular learning. This is censured by certain austere persons, who are very fond of the ancient monastic discipline, and who think that literary pursuits are disreputable

for monks, because they divert the mind from the contemplation of divine things. As this sentiment was advanced with excessive ardour, especially by Armand John Bouthillier de Rancé, abbot of La Trappe, in his book *des Devoirs Monastiques* (on the duties of monks), the most learned of the Benedictines, John Mabillon, was directed to defend the cause of his fraternity; which he did, in his well-known work on Monastic Studies, which was first published Paris, 1691, 8vo, and often afterwards, and translated also into the Latin and other languages. Hence arose that noted controversy in France, 'How far is it suitable for a monk to attend to literature?' an elegant history of which has been given to the world by Vincent Thuillier, a very learned monk of the congregation of St. Maur: published among the *Opera Posthuma Mabillonii et Ruinarti*, i. 365—426.

¹ A list of the writings and works with which the congregation of St. Maur have favoured the learned world, is given by Philip le Cerf, *Bibliothèque Historique et Critique des Auteurs de la Congrégation de St. Maur*; Hague, 1726, 8vo, and by Bernh. Pez, *Bibliotheca Benedictino-Mauriana*: Augsburg, 1716, 8vo. These monks are going on, with great perseverance, to benefit both sacred and profane learning, with their elaborate and excellent productions. [A more complete catalogue of their works is in the *Histoire Littéraire de la Congrégation de St. Maur, ordre de St. Benoît, où l'on trouve la vie et les travaux des auteurs qu'elle a produits depuis son origine en 1618, jusqu'à présent, avec les titres, énumération, l'analyse, des différentes éditions des livres, qu'ils ont donnés au public, et le jugement, que les Savans en ont porté; ensemble la notice de beaucoup d'ouvrages manuscrits, composés par des Bénédictins du même corps*. Brussels and Paris, 1770, 4to. Schl.]

to God. Besides others, who had not the fortune to become so celebrated, the Jansenists proposed this rigid reformation of the monks; and they exhibited some examples of it in France,¹ the most perfect and best known of which, was that which took place in the convent of sacred virgins, bearing the name of *Port-Royal*, and which has flourished from the year 1618 down to the present time. [A.D. 1753.²] Several emulated this example; but the most successful and zealous of all these was, in the year 1664, *Armand John Bouthillier de Rancé*, abbot of La Trappe, a man of noble birth, whose good fortune it was to keep his associates clear from that ill name of extravagant superstition, which the Jansenists had contracted, although they fared as hardly as ever the old Cistercians did, if their discipline did not actually surpass by its austerity the ancient Cistercian standard. The fraternity established by this noted man still flourishes under the name of the *Reformed Bernardines of La Trappe*, and has been propagated among the Italians and the Spaniards; though, if credit is to be given to the testimony of many, it has gradually departed much from the very painful discipline of its founder.³

¹ See *Mémoires de Portroyal*, ii. 601, 602. In particular, that most celebrated Jansenist, Martin de Barcos, introduced the austere discipline of ancient monks into the monastery of St. Cyran, of which he was abbot. See *Gallia Christiana*, ii. 132. Moleon, *Voyages Liturgiques*, p. 135, &c. But after his death, the monks of St. Cyran, like those of other places, relapsed into their old habits. See *Voyage de Deux Bénédictins*, i. 18, &c.

² Helyot, *Hist. des Ordres*, t. v. c. xlv. p. 455. [The connexion of the so-called Jansenists with Port Royal ceased in 1709, when Port-Royal des Champs was broken up. *Ed.*]

³ See Marsollier, *Vie de l'Abbé de la Trappe*, Paris, 1702, 4to; 1703, 2 vols. 12mo. Meaupou (a doctor of the Sorbonne), *Vie de M. l'Abbé de la Trappe*, 1702, 2 vols. 8vo. Felibien, *Description de l'Abbaye de la Trappe*, Paris, 1671, 12mo. Helyot, *Hist. des Ordres*, t. vi. c. 1, &c. [The author of this reformation lived in a thoughtless, unprincipled manner, and kept up an illicit intercourse with a French lady, Madame de Montbazou. Her sudden death by the small-pox, and the unexpected sight of her mutilated corpse, brought him to the resolution of becoming a Carthusian. The common statement is this:—The abbot had received no notice of the lady's sickness, and, after an absence of six weeks, returned from the country to visit her. He went directly to her chamber, by a secret stair-way, with which he was acquainted, and there found her dead, and her corpse mutilated. For the leaden coffin which had been made for her was too short, and it was found necessary to cut off her head. The

sight of her corpse in the coffin, and her head on the table, so affected him, that he resolved to forsake the world, and to embrace 'the severest monastic order. Vigneul-Marville (*Mélanges d'Hist. et de Littérature*, Rotterd. 1700, 8vo, iii. 126) contradicts this statement. He says thus much only was true: the abbot had been a particular friend of this lady; and once, on waiting on her, he learned from a gentleman in her antechamber, that she had the small-pox, and was then wishing the attendance of a clergyman. The abbot went to call on her; and on his return found her dying. He was much affected on the occasion; but it was two or three years after this event that he formed his rigorous establishment. And probably the additions and alterations of the story were invented, for the sake of giving it a romantic aspect. Be this as it may, the abbot changed his life, and established an order, into which none would enter but melancholy people, who were weary of the whole world, and constantly in fear of losing heaven. They allowed of no scientific or literary pursuits, and in their library had none but devotional books. Their worship was continued day and night; and if a cloister contained so many as 24 monks, they were divided into three classes, which interchanged continually. All these monks lived very austere; and observed a rigorous silence, conversing together only once a week, and then not on worldly things. Their time was divided between manual labour, the canonical exercises, and private devotion. They lived wholly on bread, herbs, and pulse. *Schl.*]

§ 27. Of the new orders of monks which arose in this century,—for that fruitful mother, the church, has never ceased to produce such fraternities,—we shall notice only those which have acquired some celebrity. We mention first, the French society of *Fathers of the Oratory of the Holy Jesus*, instituted in 1613 by *John Berulle*,¹ a man of various talents, who served the commonwealth and religion, the court and the church, with equal ability, and was at last a *cardinal*. This institution was, in reality, intended to oppose the Jesuits. It has trained up, and still is training up, many persons eminent for piety, eloquence, and erudition. But through the influence of the Jesuits, who were its enemies, it fell under a suspicion of broaching new doctrines in certain of its publications. The priests who enter this fraternity do not divest themselves of private property; but, so long as they continue in the society (and they are at liberty to retire from it when they please), they relinquish all prospects of admission to any sacred office which has attached to it fixed revenues, or rank and honour. They are required faithfully to discharge all the duties of *priests*, and to make it their greatest care and effort to perfect themselves and others more and more continually in the art of profitably discharging those duties. Their associations, therefore, may not improperly be denominated schools for *sacerdotal theology*. In more recent times, however, they have in fact begun to teach elegant literature, and branches of learning connected with religion.² With these

¹ [*Peter de Berulle* was his real name. He was born of an ancient family in Champagne, in 1575, and first gained notice as a disputant against the protestants, who were then very numerous in France. Having, besides the advantage of gentle birth, great sweetness of temper and eminent intellectual endowments, he was thought remarkably fit for restoring the monastic system among his countrymen to some sort of efficiency. He first justified this opinion of him by naturalising, after many difficulties, a Spanish Carmelite society among the French. In his next enterprise, that of establishing in France a body of secular priests, upon the system lately brought into action by Philip Neri, in Italy, he had to struggle with the Jesuits, who considered this new community as a rival to their own. Berulle, however, succeeded. Among the events of his life most interesting to Englishmen, was his connexion with Henrietta Maria, queen to Charles I. He solicited at Rome the dispensation for her marriage, and accompanied her to England. The English *schism*, as he called our Reformation, he attributed chiefly to the unconciliating spirit with which Henry VIII. was met at Rome. Berulle's own character was perfectly disinterested. He had made a vow in early life to accept no ecclesiastical dignity, and it was not until Urban VIII.

dispensed with his vow, and pressed him to become a cardinal, that he consented, in 1627, to accept that dignity, for the support of which he was preferred to two abbasies. He died in 1629, universally respected, although his elevation to the Roman purple had been far from generally acceptable to the French prelacy, several of their body considering themselves to have prior claims. S.]

² See Habert de Cerisy, *Vie du Cardinal Berulle, Fondateur de l'Oratoire de Jésus*; Paris, 1646, 4to. Jo. Morin's *Life*, prefixed to his *Antiquit. Orientales*, p. 3, 4, 5, 110. Rich. Simon's *Lettres Choisies*, ii. 60, and his *Bibliothèque Critique* (which he published under the fictitious name of Sainiore), iii. 303, 324, 330, &c. On the character of Berulle, see Adr. Baillet's *Vie de Richer*, p. 220, 342. Mich. le Vassor, *Histoire de Louis XIII.* iii. 397, &c. Helvyot, *Hist. des Ordres*, t. viii. c. x. p. 53, &c. *Gallia Christiana Benedictinor.* vii. 976, &c. [These *Fathers of the Oratory* must not be confounded with the Italian order, of the same name, established in the preceding century by Philip Neri. (See cent. xvi. sect. iii. c. i. § 18.) Both agree in this, that they devote themselves to learning; but the Italians pursue, especially, church history; while the French pursue all branches of learning. The founder of this order, Berulle, was in so high favour with

we join the *Priests of the Missions*, an order founded by *Vincent de Paula*, who was canonised not long since. They were constituted a regular and legitimate society in 1632 by *Urban VIII*. To fulfil the designs of their founder, they must attend especially to three things: first, to improve and amend themselves daily by prayers, meditation, reading, and other things; secondly, to perform sacred missions among the people living in the country towns and villages, eight months in the year, in order to imbue the country people with religious knowledge, and quicken their piety (from which service they derive their name of *Priests of the Missions*); and lastly to superintend seminaries, in which young men are educated for the priesthood, and to train up candidates for the sacred office.¹ Under the counsel and patronage of the *Priests of the Missions* are the *Virgins of Love*, or the *Sisters of Charity*, whose business it is to minister to the indigent in sickness. They originated from a noble lady, *Louisa le Gras*; and received the approbation of *Clement IX*. in 1660.² The *Brethren and Sisters of the pious and Christian schools* were instituted by *Nicolas Barre* in 1678. They are usually called *Piarists*; and their principal object is the education of poor children of both sexes.³ But it would be tedious to expatiate on this subject, and to enumerate all the religious associations which, in the various parts of the Roman jurisdiction, were now set up with great expectations, and then suddenly neglected and suffered to become extinct.

§ 28. The society of Jesuits, by which as its soul the whole body of the Romish community is governed, if it could have been oppressed and trodden to dust by hosts of enemies, by numberless indignities, by the most horrid criminations, and by various calamities, must undoubtedly have become extinct, or at least must have been divested of all reputation and confidence. The French, the Belgians, the Poles, the Italians, have attacked it with fury; and have boldly charged it, both publicly and privately, with every species of crimes and errors that the imagination can conceive, as most pernicious to the souls of men and to the peace and safety of civil governments. The Jansenists especially, and those who accord with them partially, or wholly, in sentiment, have exposed its character in numberless publications, strengthened not merely by satire and groundless declamation, but by demonstrations, testimony, and documents of the most credible nature.⁴ This immense host, however, of accusers and

the queen of France, Anne of Austria, that cardinal Richelieu envied him: and his death, which occurred in 1629, was so sudden, that some conjectured he died of poison. The Fathers of the Oratory are not monks, but secular clergymen; nor do they chant any canonical hours. They are called Fathers of the *Oratory*, because they have no churches, in which the sacraments are administered, but only chapels, or *oratories*, in which they read prayers and preach. *Schl.*]

¹ M. Abely, *Vie de M. Vincent de Paul*;

Paris, 1664, 4to. Helyot, *l. c. t. viii. c. xi. p. 64.* *Gallia Christiana*, vii. 998, &c.

² Gobillon, *Vie de Madame le Gras, fondatrice des Filles de la Charité*; Paris, 1676, 12mo.

³ Helyot, *Hist. des Ordres*, t. viii. c. xxx. p. 233.

⁴ Here is matter for a volume, or rather for many large volumes; for there is scarcely any part of the catholic world which does not offer for our inspection some conflict of the Jesuits with the magistrates, with other orders of monks, or with

of most decided enemies seems not so much to have weakened and depressed this very prudent sect as to have exalted it and enriched it with possessions and honours of every kind. For the Jesuits, without parrying the strokes of their enemies by replies and noisy disputation, but by silence for the most part, and patience, have held on their course, amidst all these storms, and, reaching their desired haven, have possessed themselves, with wonderful facility, of their supremacy in the Roman church. The very countries in which the Jesuits were once viewed as monsters and public pests, have sometimes voluntarily, and sometimes involuntarily, surrendered no small share of their interests and concerns to the discretion and good faith of this most potent fraternity.¹

§ 29. Literature and the sciences, both the elegant and the solid branches, acquired additional honour and glory in the better provinces of the Roman church. Among the French, the Italians, the Spaniards, the Belgians, all in communion with Rome, there was no want of men distinguished for their genius and their knowledge of various sciences and languages. But we must not ascribe this prosperous state of learning to the influence of the public schools. For in these, both of the higher and lower orders, its place has been maintained, even

the bishops and other religious teachers; from which the Jesuits, though they might seem to be vanquished, yet finally came off victorious. An attempt was made to bring together all these facts, which lie scattered and dispersed through numberless writers, by a man of the Jansenist party, who a few years ago undertook to write a history of the order of Jesuits, if he should be permitted to fulfil the promises in his *Préface: Histoire des Religieux de la Compagnie de Jésus*, tom. i. Utrecht, 1741, 8vo. And no man was more competent to finish the work commenced by him, than he; unless we are to regard as fabulous all that he tells us respecting his travels and his sufferings for many years, while exploring the plans, policy, and operations of the Jesuits. But this good man, imprudently venturing to go into France, was discovered, it is said, by his enemies, and assassinated. Hence his work was carried no farther than the third volume. [Maclaine, in his note here, written at the Hague, about 1764, says this man was a Frenchman, named Benard; that he was then living at the Hague; that he had not been massacred in France, but had returned in safety from his visit to that country; that he had never travelled, in the manner he pretended in his preface, to collect information, but had collected all his information from books in his study, and had made up the story of his travels to amuse his readers and procure credit to his book; and that no good reason was offered for his having violated his promise

to continue the work. J. M. Schroeckh (in his *Kirchengesch. s. d. Reformat.* ii. 645) tells us, on the authority of a Dutch journal, that the man's name was Peter Quesnel, with the surname Menard; that he had never travelled as he pretended; that he died at the Hague in 1774; and that the report was, he was persuaded, a little before his death, to burn the manuscript of the residue of his work, which was sufficient to fill 20 volumes. *Tr.*]

¹ Perhaps no people have attacked the Jesuits with more animosity and energy, or done them more harm, than the French. Those who wish to learn what was said and done against them, by the parliament, by the university of Paris, and by the people of France, may consult Cæsar Egasse de Boulay, *Hist. Academiæ Parisiensis*, vi. 559—648, 676, 738, 742, 744, 763, 774, 874—890, 898, 909: who has scarcely omitted anything relating to the subject. And what was the issue of all these most vehement contests? The Jesuits, after being ignominiously expelled from France, were first honourably received again, under Henry IV. in 1604, notwithstanding the indignation of so many men of the greatest reputation and of the highest rank, who were opposed to them. See the *Mémoires du Duc de Sully*; the late edition of Geneva, v. 83, &c. 314, &c. In the next place, they were admitted to the government both of the church and of the state; and this felicity they retain quite to our times.

down to our own times, by that ancient, jejune, and barbarous mode of teaching, which blunts, retards, depresses the minds of men, instead of sharpening and raising them; while it loads the memory with a multitude of terms and distinctions, void alike of meaning and utility. But beyond the limits of these reputed seats of learning, certain great and excellent men guided others to a better and more profitable method of prosecuting study. In this matter the pre-eminence is justly due to the French; who being prompted by the native powers of genius, and encouraged by the munificence of *Lewis XIV.* towards learning and learned men, treated nearly all branches of literature and science in the happiest manner; and rejecting the barbarism of the schools, exhibited learning in a new and elegant dress, fit for captivating the mind.¹ And how greatly the efforts of this very refined nation tended to rescue the other nations from scholastic bondage, no person, of but a moderate share of information, can well be ignorant.

§ 30. No means whatever could remove from the chairs of philosophy those misnamed *Aristotelians*, who were continually quoting *Aristotle*, while in reality they did not understand him. Nor could the court of Rome, which is afraid of everything new, for a long time persuade itself to allow the new discoveries of the philosophers to be freely promulged and explained; as is manifest from the sufferings of *Galileo*, a Tuscan mathematician, who was cast into prison for bringing forward the Copernican system of astronomy. Some among the French, led on by *René des Cartes* and *Peter Gassendi*,² of whom the former confuted the Peripatetics by his doctrines, and the latter by his writings, first ventured to abandon the thorny fields of the Aristotelians, and to follow more liberal principles of philosophizing. Among these there were some Jesuits, but a much larger number from among the *Fathers of the Oratory* and the disciples of *Jansen*, who distinguished themselves. Here will readily occur to many minds the names of *Malebranche*, *Antony Arnauld*, *Bernard Lami*, *Peter Nicole*, and *Blaise Pascal*, who acquired lasting fame, by illustrating, perfecting, and adapting to common use the principles of *Des Cartes*.³ For *Gassendi*, who professed to understand but few things, and who rather taught how to philosophize, than proposed a system of philosophy, found no such great number to approve of him among a people eager for knowledge,

¹ This will be found illustrated by Voltaire, in the noted work already quoted repeatedly: *Siècle de Louis XIV.* and in his *Additions* to that work, [in the edition, Paris, 1820, vol. ii. cap. xxxi—xxxiv. *Tr.*]

² *Gassendi's Exercitationes Paradoxe adversus Aristoteleos*, is in his *Opera*, iii. 95, &c. and is an accurate and elegant performance, which did great harm to the cause of the Peripatetics. See the remarks already made [in section i. § 31, of this century. *Tr.*]

³ The reward which these men got for

their labours, was, that they were charged with atheism by the Peripatetics; John Harduin, who was intoxicated with the Aristotelico-Scholastic philosophy, being the accuser: *Athei Detecti*, in his *Opera Posthuma*, p. 1, &c. and p. 259. Nor is the cause of this odium very difficult to be discovered. For the Cartesian philosophy, which avoids all darkness and obscurity, is much less efficacious for defending the Romish cause, than the vulgar scholastic philosophy, which delights in darkness.

sanguine, ardent, and impatient of protracted labour. Towards the close of the century, some of the Italians as well as other nations, began to imitate the French; at first indeed timidly, but afterwards more confidently, as the pontiffs appeared to relax a little of that jealousy which they had entertained against the new views of the naturalists, mathematicians, and metaphysicians.

§ 31. But it is proper to notice here, more distinctly, who were the persons entitled to the praise of having preserved and advanced both divine and human learning in the Roman church. During a large part of the century the Jesuits were nearly the only teachers of all branches of learning; and they alone, among the monks, were accounted learned men. And the man must either be ignorant or uncandid, who can deny that many extraordinary and very learned men have been ornaments to that society. Lasting as literature itself will be the merits of *Denys Petau* (*Dionysius Petavius*¹), *James Sirmond*,² *Peter Possin*,³ *Philip Labbé*,⁴ *Nicolas Abrams*,⁵ and even of *John Harduin*,⁶ though he was an out-of-the-way man in many things, and scarcely sane, as well as of many others. But as the century advanced, this literary glory of the Jesuits was greatly obscured by the Benedictines, especially by those belonging to the *Congregation of St. Maur*. For while the Jesuits talked immoderately of their merits and renown, and were unceasingly censuring the sloth and indolence of the Benedictines, in order to give plausibility to their designs of invading and appropriating to themselves the revenues and the goods of the Benedictines, the latter saw the necessity of wiping this stain away, as it could not wholly be denied, and of disarming the violent cupidity of their enemies, by making themselves really meritorious. Wherefore, they not only opened schools in their convents for instructing youth in all branches of learning, but also appointed select individuals of the best talents, to publish great and imperishable works, which might vindicate the ancient glory and reputation of the Benedictine family against its traducers. This task has been admirably fulfilled, and with a success which baffles description, for about a century past, by such superior men as *John Mabillon*,⁷

¹ [Petau, born in 1583, died 1652; wrote largely on chronology, and the history of religious doctrines; and ably edited several of the fathers, particularly Epiphanius. *Tr.*]

² [Sirmond, confessor to Louis XIII., died 1651, aged 92; wrote much on church history, and edited several of the fathers. His works were printed, Paris, 1696, 5 vols. fol. *Tr.*]

³ [Possin, born in 1590, and died at Rome near the end of the 17th century; was distinguished as a Hebrew and Greek scholar, and for his editions of the fathers. *Tr.*]

⁴ [Labbé of Bourges, died in 1667, aged 60. He was a man of great learning, particularly in church history; but proud and overbearing. *Tr.*]

⁵ [Abrams, born 1589, died 1655, was chiefly distinguished for polite learning, and for his comments on Cicero's *Orations*, and on Virgil. *Tr.*]

⁶ [Harduin, died at Paris in 1729, aged 83. He was a prodigy of learning; but maintained, that most of the Greek and Latin classics were forgeries of the monks in the middle age. His best work is his *Acts of the Councils*, in 12 vols. fol. *Tr.*]

⁷ [Mabillon was born in 1632, and died at Paris in 1707. He travelled much for literary research, in France, Germany, and Italy; and besides publishing the works of St. Bernard, and the lives of Sainted Benedictines (*Acta Sanctorum ordinis Benedicti*), and his *Analecta Veterum*, he composed *Diplomatics*, *Annals of the Benedictines*, and some smaller works. *Tr.*]

Luke d'Achery (*Dacherius*¹), *René Massuet*,² *Theodore Ruinart*,³ *Anthony Beaugendre*,⁴ *Julian Garnier*,⁵ *Charles de la Rue*,⁶ *Edmund Martene*,⁷ *Bernard Montfaucon*,⁸ and many others; some of whom have published excellent editions of the Greek and Latin fathers; others have drawn from the obscure shelves of libraries those ancient charters which serve to elucidate the history and antiquities of the church; others have explained the ancient events in church and state, the customs and rites of former times, the chronology of the world, and other parts of polite learning; and others have executed other works worthy to be handed down to posterity. I know not how it happened; but from the time these new stars appeared above the literary horizon, the splendour of Jesuit erudition began gradually to decline. For there is no one disposed to deny that, for a long time past, the Jesuits in vain look around among their order to find an individual that may be compared with the Benedictines; who are constantly pursuing strenuously every branch of literature, and publishing almost every year distinguished monuments of their genius and erudition; nor have the Jesuits for many years published a single work that can compete with the labours of the Benedictines; unless it be the *Acta Sanctorum*, now issuing from their press at Antwerp. The rivals of the Benedictines were the French *Fathers of the Oratory*; many of whom are acknowledged to have laboured successfully in advancing several branches of both human and divine knowledge: which, if there were no other examples, would be manifest from the works of *Charles le Cointe*, author of the imperishable *Ecclesiastical Annals of France*,⁹ and of *John Morin*,¹⁰

¹ [D'Achery, born 1608, died 1685; collected judiciously, and published numerous unprinted writings, pertaining to ecclesiastical history, in 13 vols. 4to, or (2nd ed.) in 3 vols. fol. entitled *Spicilegium*, &c. Tr.]

² [Massuet, born 1665, died 1716; published the best edition of Irenæus. Tr.]

³ [Ruinart, born 1657, died 1709; was associated with Mabillon, and published *Acts of the ancient Martyrs*, the works of Gregory Turonensis, and of Victor Vitensis; and some other works. Tr.]

⁴ [Beaugendre is noted only for the lives of some French bishops, and an edition of the works of Hildebert. Tr.]

⁵ [Garnier, died 1723, aged 53; noted as editor of the works of St. Basil, 3 vols. fol. Tr.]

⁶ [De la Rue, born 1685, died 1739, an associate of Montfaucon, and editor of the works of Origen, 3 vols. fol. He must not be confounded with the Jesuit of the same name, who was a poet and editor of Virgil, in *Usum Delphini*. Tr.]

⁷ [Martene, died 1739, aged 85; he travelled much to explore monasteries and libraries, and published a commentary on the Rule of St. Benedict; on the ancient

monastic rites; a *Thesaurus* of unpublished works, in 5 vols. fol. and with Durand, a *Collectio* of the same kind, in 10 vols. fol., and he and Durand were the Benedictine travellers, authors of *Voyage Littéraire de Deux Religieux de la Congrégation de S. Maur*. Tr.]

⁸ [Montfaucon, born 1655, died 1741, aged 87; a very learned antiquarian, known by his *Analecæ Græcæ*, 4to; *Palæographia Græca*, fol.; the works of Athanasius, 3 vols. fol.; Origen's *Hexapla*, 2 vols. fol.; Chrysostom's works, 13 vols. fol.; *Antiquité expliquée et représentée en figures*, 15 vols. fol.; *Monumens de la Monarchie Française*, 5 vols. fol.; a *Collection of the Greek Fathers*, 2 vols. fol.; *Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum*, 2 vols. fol.; and some other works. Tr.]

⁹ [Le Cointe, born 1611, died 1681. His *Annales Ecclesiast. Francorum*, in 8 vols. fol. extends from 235 to 835. Tr.]

¹⁰ [Morin, born 1591, educated a protestant, became a catholic, and died at Paris, 1659. He wrote on the Origin of Patriarchs and Primates; on the Samaritan Pentateuch; and published an edition of the *Septuagint*, 2 vols. fol. and the *Samaritan*

Lewis Thomassin,¹ and *Richard Simon*.² Lastly, the Jansenists, or at least those who favoured the sentiments of *Augustine*, published various works, some erudite, and others neatly and methodically composed, very useful both to adults and to the young. Who is such a stranger to the literature of that age as not to have heard of the works of the *Messieurs de Port-Royal*;³ and of the very elegant and useful productions of *Tillemont*,⁴ *Arnauld*,⁵ *Nicole*,⁶ *Pascal*,⁷ *Lancelot*,⁸ and others? The other religious orders, as well as the bishops and inferior clergy, in the Roman church, had also their great men. For it would be strange, if, in such a multitude of men enjoying much leisure and all advantages for study, there should not be some successful scholars. Yet all who acquired fame and merited distinction as learned men and authors, outside of those four orders just mentioned, would collectively scarcely form so large a body as any one of those orders alone can exhibit.

§ 32. Hence a copious list might be drawn up of learned men in the Roman church, who live in works, composed with great care and diligence, although they themselves are dead. Of the monastic families and the priests bound to live according to certain rules, the most distinguished were *Cesar Baronius*,⁹ and *Bellarmino*,¹⁰ both

Pentateuch. There were several distinguished men named Morin. *Tr.*]

¹ [Thomassin, born 1619, died 1695; published a history of religious doctrines, a feeble imitation of Denys Petau's work, in 3 vols. fol. Paris, 1680. Voltaire says he was 'a man of profound erudition: and first composed Dialogues on the Fathers, on Councils, and on History.' *Tr.*]

² [Simon, born 1638, died 1712; a great critic: wrote *Critical History of the Old Test.*; *History of Ecclesiastical Revenues*, 2 vols. 12mo; *Critical Diss. on Du Pin's Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclésiast.*; *Crit. Hist. of the New Test.*, and various other works. *Tr.*]

³ By this title are designated all the Jansenist writers; but especially, and in a stricter sense, those who spent their lives in literary and devotional pursuits, in the retired situation of Port-Royal, not far from Paris. Among these, it is generally known, there were great men who possessed first-rate talents, and were very finished writers.

⁴ [Sebastian le Nain de Tillemont, born at Paris, 1637, died 1698, refused a bishopric, and wrote *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire Ecclésiast. des six premiers Siècles*, Paris, 1693, &c. 16 vols. 4to, and *Histoire des Empereurs et autres Princes, jusqu'à l'Empereur Honorius*. *Tr.*]

⁵ [Anthony Arnauld, or Arnaud, was born at Paris, 1612, and died at Liège, 1694. He wrote on grammar, logic, and geometry; and polemic pieces against the Jesuits and the Calvinists on moral subjects; and is supposed to have contributed

Nos. 3, 9, 12, 13, 14, and 15, to the *Provincial Letters*. *Tr.*]

⁶ [Peter Nicole, born 1625, died at Paris, 1695. Besides controversial pieces against the Jesuits, and aiding Arnaud in some works, he wrote *Essais de Moral*, 13 vols. 12mo. *On the Perpetuity of the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist*, 3 vols. *Préjugés légitimes contre les Calvinistes*; and translated the *Provincial Letters* into Latin, with large notes, under the fictitious name of William Wendrock. *Tr.*]

⁷ [Blaise Pascal, born at Clermont, 1623, died 1662. Besides his *Pensées*, and some treatises on Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, he composed the famous *Lettres à un Provincial*. His works were printed in 5 vols. 8vo, Paris, 1799. *Tr.*]

⁸ [Claude Lancelot, born 1616, died 1695; taught Greek and the mathematics at Port-Royal; and had a hand in the school-books there published. *Tr.*]

⁹ [Baronius, born at Sora, in Naples, 1538, second general of the Italian order of Fathers of the Oratory, confessor to pope Clement VIII., cardinal and librarian of the Vatican; wrote *Annales Ecclesiastici*, 12 vols. fol. Rome, 1688—1607; was candidate for the papal chair in 1605; and died in 1607. *Tr.*]

¹⁰ [Bellarmino, a Florentine, born in 1542, cardinal in 1599, died in 1621. He wrote *Opus Controversiarum*, 3 vols. fol., *De Potestate summi Pontificis*, a *Commentary on the Psalms*, and an account of the ecclesiastical writers. He was learned, and a giant reasoner, though in a bad cause. *Tr.*—

cardinals, and both extremely useful to their church, the first by his elaborate *Annals*, and the latter by his controversial writings; also *Nicolas Serrarius*,¹ *Francis Feuardent*,² *Anthony Possevin*,³ *James Gretser*,⁴ *Francis Combesis*,⁵ *Natalis Alexander* (*Noel Alexandre*)⁶, *Martin Becan*,⁷ *James Sirmond*, *Dionysius Petavius*, *Peter Possin*, *Lewis Cellot*,⁸ *Nicholas Caussin*,⁹ *John Morin*, *Theophilus Raynard* (*Raynaudus*)¹⁰, *Paul Sarpi*,¹¹ *Sfortia Pallavicini*,¹² *Philip Labbé*,

Robert Bellarmine, or Bellarmino, was born at Monte Pulciano, in Tuscany, and enrolled himself among the Jesuits in 1560. His importance in Romish controversy of a doctrinal kind, is the same as that of Baronius, in history. His great work is entitled, *Roberti Bellarmini, e Societate Jesu, S. R. E. Cardinalis, Disputationes de Controversiis Christianæ Fidei, adversus hujus temporis Hæreticos*. This has been, ever since its publication, the main repository of Romish arguments, but the party which it serves so effectually has never been altogether satisfied with it. Bellarmine's mind was too great for the lower arts of controversy: hence he states the objections of opponents with a degree of candour that has made some people speak of his *Controversies* as quite as useful for attacking, as for defending, the church of Rome. In defending the papacy, too, although he went so far as to disgust a large portion of the Romish world, yet he fell short of the extravagances current at Rome: hence Sixtus V. condemned his treatise *De Romano Pontifice*, as injurious to the papal see. Another of his controversial works was an attack, under the name of Matthew Tortus, upon James I. of England, of which the drift was, to encourage English Romanists in refusing, or evading, the oaths prescribed by law. This was answered by Bp. Andrewes. He also wrote a catechism, which became highly popular, but which embodies principles so unfavourable to civil power, that even Maria Theresa suppressed it in her dominions. Bellarmine likewise wrote some ascetic pieces, which have been highly prized among Romanists. He was, indeed, no less exemplary than able, but like other men with his weaknesses, as all the world saw after his death, when an Autobiography appeared, which showed him to have possessed a degree of vanity, that people at a distance little suspected in him. *S.*

¹ [Serrarius, of Lorraine, a Jesuit, died at Mentz in 1610, aged 65; a voluminous commentator on the Bible. His works fill 16 vols. fol. *Tr.*]

² [Feuardent, of Normandy, a Franciscan, born 1541, died 1641; edited Irenæus; wrote and preached, furiously, against the protestants. *Tr.*]

³ [Possevin was a Jesuit of Mantua,

born 1533, died 1611. He was papal legate to Poland, Sweden, Germany, &c. He wrote *Bibliotheca selecta de Ratione Studiorum*, 2 vols. fol. *Apparatus Sacer*, 2 vols. fol. and some other things. *Tr.*]

⁴ [Gretser, a German Jesuit, born 1561, professor of theology at Ingolstadt; died 1636. He wrote much against the protestants. His works fill 17 vols. fol. *Tr.*]

⁵ [Combesis, a Dominican of Guienne, died 1679. A fine Greek scholar, and editor of several Greek fathers, and of five Greek historians. *Tr.*]

⁶ [Natalis Alexander, a Dominican of Rouen, died in 1724, aged 86. He wrote *Historiæ Eccles. Vet. et Novi Test. selecta Capita*, in 30 vols. 8vo, 8 vols. fol. and 18 vols. 4to, also a *System of Theology*, 2 vols. fol. His *Eccles. History* is candid and learned, but written in a dry and argumentative manner. *Tr.*]

⁷ [Becan, a Jesuit of Brabant, confessor to Ferdinand II., died at Vienna, in 1624. He wrote much against the protestants, and a *Sum of Theology*, in French. *Tr.*]

⁸ [Cellot, a Jesuit of Paris, died 1658. He wrote the History of Gottschalk, and published the *Opuscula* of Hincmar of Rheims. *Tr.*]

⁹ [Caussin, a French Jesuit, died 1651, aged 71. He was confessor to Louis XIII. and wrote *de Sacra et Profana Eloquentia*, and some other things. *Tr.*]

¹⁰ [Raynard, an Italian Jesuit, died at Lyons, 1663, aged 80. He edited several of the Fathers, and wrote *Tables for sacred and profane History*. His works were printed at Lyons, 1665, in 20 vols. fol. *Tr.*]

¹¹ [Sarpi, a Venetian monk of the order of Servites, born 1552, died 1623; a celebrated defender of the religious liberties of his country against the pontiff. He wrote a *History of the Council of Trent*, fol., a *History of Benefices*, and various tracts in defence of his country, which fill 6 vols. 12mo. Venice, 1677. *Tr.*]

¹² [Pallavicini, a Jesuit and cardinal, born at Rome, 1607, died 1667. He wrote, in Italian, a *History of the Council of Trent*, opposed to that of Sarpi, Rome, 1656, 2 vols. fol. translated into Latin, Antw. 1673, 2 vols. fol.; also a Treatise on Style, &c. *Tr.*]

Lewis Maimbourg,¹ *Lewis Thomassin*, *Cælestine Sfondrati*,² *Joseph Aguirre*,³ *Henry Noris*,⁴ *Luke d'Achery*, *John Mabillon*, *John Harduin*, *Richard Simon*, *Theodore Ruinart*, *Bernard de Montfaucon*, *Anthony Gallon*,⁵ *Fortunatus Scacchi*,⁶ *Cornelius a Lapide*,⁷ *James Bonfrere*,⁸ *Hugh Menard*,⁹ *Claude Seguenot*,¹⁰ *Bernard Lami*,¹¹ *John Bolland*,¹² *Godfrey Henschen*,¹³ *Daniel Papebroch*,¹⁴ and many others. Of the other clergy, or those not of any religious order, but secular clergymen, as they are called, in distinction from the regular clergy, the following acquired distinction and fame by their writings; viz. *James David Perron*,¹⁵ *William Est (Estius)*¹⁶, *John Launoi*,¹⁷ *Gabriel Aubespine (Albaspineus)*¹⁸, *Peter de Marca*,¹⁹ *John Armand*

¹ [Maimbourg, a French Jesuit of Nancy, born 1610, died 1686, noted as a preacher, but more as an historian. His *Histoire du Lutheranisme* was refuted by Seekendorf; his *Hist. du Calvinisme* by Jurieu and by Jo. Bapt. de Rocoles. He also wrote Histories of Arianism, of the Iconoclasts, of the Crusades, of the schism of the Greeks, of the schism of the West, of the decay of the Empire, of the League, of the pontificate of Leo the Great. He is a sprightly writer, but a partial historian. Tr.]

² [Sfondrati, a Benedictine abbot of St. Gall, and a cardinal, died at Rome, 1696, aged 53. He wrote *Gallia Vindicata*, and *Nodus Prædestinationis dissolutus*, 4to. Tr.]

³ [Aguirre, a Spanish Benedictine, professor at Salamanca, defended the papal supremacy against the French, was made a cardinal, published *Collectio maxima Conciliorum omnium Hispan. et Novi Orbis*, &c. 6 vols. fol. and died at Rome, 1699, aged 69. Tr.]

⁴ [Noris, an Augustinian Eremit, born at Verona, 1631, of Irish parentage, professor of Eccl. Hist. at Pisa, librarian of the Vatican, a cardinal in 1695, and died at Rome in 1704. He wrote a *Hist. of Pelagianism*, *History of Investitures*, and various other learned works, printed collectively, Verona, 1729, 1730, 5 vols. fol. Tr.]

⁵ [Gallonio, a Roman presbyter of the Oratory, died 1605. He wrote *de Cruciatibus Martyrum*, with plates, 1594, 4to, and some other things. Tr.]

⁶ [Scacchi was an Italian Augustinian Eremit, who corrected the Romish Martyrology and Breviary, and died in 1640. Tr.]

⁷ [a Lapide was a Jesuit of Liege, who wrote *Commentaries on the Bible*, 10 vols. fol. and died at Rome, 1637, aged 71. Tr.]

⁸ [Bonfrere was a Jesuit, professor at Douay, wrote *Commentaries on the Pentateuch*, on Scripture names, &c., and died at Tournay, 1643, aged 70. Tr.]

⁹ [Menard was a Benedictine of St. Maur, born at Paris in 1587, and died in

1644. He wrote *Diatribæ de unico Dionysio*, and *Martyrologium ex ordine Benedict.* Tr.]

¹⁰ [Seguenot was a French priest of the Oratory, wrote notes on the French translation of *Augustine de Virginitate*, which excited commotion; and died in 1644. Tr.]

¹¹ [Lami was also a French priest of the Oratory, born in 1645, and died in 1715. He wrote on geometry, on the sciences, on perspective, on Christian Morality, 5 vols. 12mo, *Apparatus Biblicus*, 4to, *de Tabernaculo*, fol., *Harmonia Evangelica*, 2 vols. 4to, &c. Tr.]

¹² [Bolland, a Jesuit of Tillemont, in Flanders, who commenced the *Acta Sanctorum*, of which he published 6 vols. fol. and died in 1665. Tr.]

¹³ [Henschen, a Jesuit of Antwerp, continuator of the *Acta Sanctorum*, died 1682. Tr.]

¹⁴ [Papebroch, a Jesuit of Antwerp, also a continuator of the *Acta Sanctor.*, died in 1714. Tr.]

¹⁵ [Perron, born a French protestant, 1556, turned catholic, became bishop of Evreux, abp. of Sens, almoner of France, and in 1604, a cardinal. He was very learned and eloquent, and a great reasoner: wrote on the Eucharist, against du Plessis Mornay, &c., and died at Paris in 1618, aged 63. His works fill 3 vols. fol. Tr.]

¹⁶ [Estius, born at Gorcum in Holland, was divinity professor and chancellor of the university of Douay, where he died in 1613, aged 71. He wrote *Commentaries on the Epistles*, 2 vols. fol., Annotations on difficult passages of Scripture, fol., and the martyrdom of Edmund Campian. Tr.]

¹⁷ [Launoi, a doctor of theology at Paris, born in 1603, and died in 1678. He was a strenuous defender of the liberties of the Gallican church, a strong opposer of legends, and a learned critic. His works were printed at Geneva, in 10 vols. fol. Tr.]

¹⁸ [Aubespine, bishop of Orleans, died 1630, aged 52. He was learned in ecclesiastical antiquities; and commented on the fathers and councils. Tr.]

¹⁹ [De Marca was born at Gart in Béarn,

Richelieu,¹ *Luke Holstein*,² *Stephen Baluze*,³ *John Bona*,⁴ *Peter Daniel Huet*,⁵ *James Benignus Bossuet*,⁶ *Francis Fenelon*,⁷ *Anthony Godeau*,⁸ *Sebastian le Nain de Tillemont*, *John Baptist Thiers*,⁹ *Lewis Ellies du Pin*,¹⁰ *Leo Allatius*,¹¹ *Lawrence Alexander Zaccagni*,¹² *John Baptist Cotelier*,¹³ *John Filesac*,¹⁴ *Joseph Visconti*,¹⁵ and others.¹⁶ This list might be greatly enlarged by adding the names of such laymen, either in private or public life, as did service to sacred and secular learning.

1594, first studied law, married and became a counsellor, then studied theology, was bishop of Conserans, archbishop of Toulouse, and lastly of Paris, where he died in 1662. This great man wrote a *History of Béarn*, and of *Concordia Imperii et Sacerdotii*. Tr.]

¹ [Richelieu, born 1585, died 1642, a cardinal, peer, and prime minister; persecuted the French protestants; and wrote a defence of the catholic faith against the protestants; a tract on the best method of confuting heretics; and several other things. Tr.]

² [Holstein. See note to § 16. He was a critic and editor, and wrote *de Abassinorum Communionis sub unica specie*; on the *Sacrament of Confirmation among the Greeks*; on the *Nicene Council*, &c. Tr.]

³ [Baluze, professor of canon law at Paris, died 1718, aged 87. He wrote *Lives of the Popes of Avignon*; and was a noted editor. Tr.]

⁴ [Bona, born in Piedmont, 1609, died at Rome, 1674, a cardinal. He wrote *Manuductio ad Cælum*; *Principia Vitæ Christianæ*; *Via Compendii ad Deum*; *de Sacrificio Missæ*; *de Discretione Spirituum*; *de Rebus Liturgicis*, lib. ii.; *de Divina Psalmodia*; *Testamentum*; and *Horologium Ascticum*. He was a very devout man. Tr.]

⁵ [Huet, born in Caen, 1630, bishop of Soissons, and of Avranches, died 1721. He was very learned, and wrote *de Interpretatione libri ii.*; *Origeniana*; *Demonstratio Evangelica*; *Censura Philosophiæ Cartesianæ*; *Questiones Alnetanæ de Concordia Rationis et Fidei*; and several other things. Tr.]

⁶ [Bossuet, born at Dijon, 1627, bishop of Meaux, counsellor of state, died 1704. This elegant writer composed a *Discourse on Universal History*; *History of the Variations among Protestant Churches*; *Funeral Orations*; *Exposition of the Catholic Faith*; *Disputes with Fenelon*, &c. collected, Paris, 1743, in 12 vols. 4to. Tr.]

⁷ [Fenelon, archbishop of Cambray, born 1651, died 1715. He wrote *Explication des Maximes des Saints sur la Vie intérieure*, in which he supported the views of Madame Guyon, and thus involved him-

self in controversy with Bossuet, and incurred censure from the pope; also *Telemachus*; *Dialogues of the Dead*; *Dialogues on Eloquence*; *Demonstration of the Existence of God*; *Spiritual Works*; and many other pieces; in all, 10 vols. 8vo. Tr.]

⁸ [Godeau, born at Dreux, 1605, died 1671, bishop of Vence. He wrote some commentaries on the Scriptures, and an *Eccles. Hist.* 3 vols. fol. 1653. Tr.]

⁹ [Thiers, born at Chartres, 1641, died 1703; professor of *Belles Lettres* at Paris; and then curate of Vivray, in the diocese of Le Mans. He wrote on Superstitions; concerning the Sacraments; on Fast-days; History of Perukes; the Crucifixion of St. Francis, &c. Tr.]

¹⁰ [Du Pin, a doctor of the Sorbonne, born at Paris, 1657, died there 1719, aged 62. He wrote *Bibliothèque Universelle des Auteurs Ecclésiast.* in 19 vols. 4to, down to A.D. 1600; *Prolegomena to the Bible*; *Notes on the Psalms and the Pentateuch*; *de Antiqua Ecclesiæ Disciplina*; *A Method of studying Divinity*; and edited the works of Optatus Milevit. and of Gerson. Tr.]

¹¹ [Allatius or Allazzi, born at Scio, in the Ægean sea, educated at Rome, teacher in the Greek college there, librarian of the Vatican, died at Rome 1669, aged 83. Besides editing various Greek works, he wrote *de Perpetua Consensione Ecclesiæ Gr. et Lat.*, and some other works. Tr.]

¹² [Zaccagni, keeper of the Vatican library, died at Rome in 1712. He published *Collectanea Monumentor. vet. Ecclesiæ Gr. et Lat.* 1698. Tr.]

¹³ [Cotelier, born at Nismes, 1627, died at Paris, 1686, aged 59. He was professor of Greek at Paris, and published the *Patres Apostolici*, 1672, 2 vols. fol. and *Monumenta Eccles. Græcæ*, 3 vols. fol. Tr.]

¹⁴ [Filesac, doctor of the Sorbonne, and dean of the Faculty of theology at Paris, died in 1638. His works were printed in 1621, 3 vols. 4to. The best is *Notes on Vincentius Lirinensis*. Tr.]

¹⁵ [Visconti, or Vicecomes, professor of eccles. antiquities at Milan. He wrote *de Antiquis Baptismi Ritibus*; and *de Ritibus Confirmationis et Missæ*. Tr.]

¹⁶ Whoever wishes to know more of the

§ 33. That the public religion of the Roman church, both as to articles of faith and rules of practice, was not purified in this century, and conformed to the only standard, the Sacred Scriptures, but was, in many places, corrupted and deformed, either by the negligence of the popes, or the zeal of the Jesuits, is the complaint, not so much of those opposed to this church, or those called *heretics*, as of all those members of it who favour solid and correct knowledge of religion and genuine piety. As to doctrines of faith, it is said that the Jesuits, with the connivance, nay, frequently with the assistance of the Roman prelates, entirely subverted such of the first principles of Christianity as the council of Trent had left untouched; for they lowered the dignity and utility of the Sacred Scriptures, extolled immoderately the power of man to do good, extenuated the efficacy and necessity of divine grace, detracted from the greatness of Christ's merits, almost equalled the Roman pontiff to our Saviour, and converted him into a terrestrial deity, and, in fine, brought the truth of Christianity itself into immense danger by their fallacious and sophistical reasonings. It is difficult to gainsay the abundant testimony by which the gravest men, particularly among the Jansenists, support these accusations. It is easy, however, to show that the Jesuits were not inventors of the doctrines which they inculcated, but in reality taught and explained that old form of the Romish religion, which was everywhere taught before *Luther's* time, and by which the authority, wealth, and power of the pontiffs and of the church had grown, during many centuries, to their immense height. The Jesuits would teach otherwise if the pontiffs wished them to use all their efforts to render the church more holy and more like Christ; but they cannot teach otherwise, so long as they are instructed to make it their first care that the pontiffs may hold what they have gotten, and recover what they have lost, and that the prelates and ministers of the church may continually become more rich and more powerful. If the Jesuits committed any error in this matter, it consisted wholly in this, that they explained more clearly and lucidly what the fathers at Trent either left imperfectly explained, or wholly passed over, lest they should shock the minds of the persons of better sentiments who attended that celebrated convention. Hence also the pontiffs, though pressed by the strongest arguments and exhortations, could never be persuaded to pass any severe censures upon the religious sentiments of the Jesuits; and, on the other hand, they have resisted, sometimes secretly, and sometimes openly, such as opposed their doctrines with more than ordinary spirit and energy; looking upon them as indiscreet persons, who either did not, or would not, know what the interests of the church required.

§ 34. That the Jesuits did not so much corrupt and vitiate the doctrine of morals in nearly all its parts, as *destroy* morality altogether, is the public complaint of innumerable writers of every class and of

societies of men in the Roman church. Nor does their complaint seem groundless, since they adduce from the books of the Jesuits, professedly treating of the right mode of living, and especially from the writings of those called *Usuists*, many principles which are opposed to all virtue and honesty. In particular, they show that these men teach the following doctrines: That a bad man, who is an entire stranger to the love of God, provided he feels some fear of the divine wrath, and from dread of punishment avoids grosser crimes, is a fit candidate for eternal salvation: That men may sin, with safety, provided they have a probable reason for the sin; *i. e.* some argument or authority in favour of it: That actions in themselves wrong, and contrary to the divine law, are allowable, provided a person can control his own mind, and in his thoughts connect a good *end* with the criminal deed; or as they express it, knows how to *direct his intention aright*: That *philosophical sins*, that is, actions which are contrary to the law of nature and to right reason, in a person ignorant of the written law of God, or dubious as to its true meaning, are light offences, and do not deserve the punishments of hell: That the deeds which a man commits, when wholly blinded by his lusts and the paroxysms of passion, and destitute of all sense of religion, though they be of the vilest and most execrable character, can by no means be charged to his account in the judgment of God, because such a man is like a madman: That it is right for a man, when taking an oath, or forming a contract, in order to deceive the judge and subvert the validity of the covenant or oath, tacitly to add something to the words of the compact or the oath: and other sentiments of the like nature.¹ These and other doctrines, not only the Dominicans

¹ One might make up a whole library of books, exposing and censuring the corrupt moral principles of the Jesuits. The best work on the subject is the very elegant and ingenious production of Blaise Pascal, entitled: *Les Provinciales, ou Lettres écrites par Louis de Montalte à un Provincial de ses amis, et aux Jésuites, sur la Morale et la Politique de ces Pères*, 2 tom. 8vo. Peter Nicole, under the fictitious name of William Wendrock, added to it learned and judicious notes, in which he copiously demonstrates the truth of what Pascal had stated either summarily or without giving authorities. It was also translated into Latin, by Samuel Racheis. [An English translation of the *Provincial Letters* was published in 1828, by J. Leavitt, New York, and Crocker and Brewster, Boston, 319 pages, 12mo. *Tr.*] Against this terrible adversary, the Jesuits sent forth their best geniuses, and among others, the very eloquent and acute Gabriel Daniel, the celebrated author of the *History of France*; and also caused Pascal's book to be publicly burnt at Paris. See Daniel's *Opuscula*, i. 363; who himself admits, that most of the answers to the book, by the

Jesuits, were unsatisfactory. But whether Pascal prevailed by the force and solidity of his arguments, or by the sweetness and elegance of his style and satire, it is certain that all these answers detracted very little from the reputation of his Letters; and edition after edition of them continued to be published. Less attractive in form, but more solid from the multitude of testimonies and citations from the approved Jesuitical writers, was *La Morale des Jésuites extraite fidèlement de leurs Livres imprimés avec la permission et l'approbation des Supérieurs de leur Compagnie, par un Docteur de Sorbonne*; in 3 vols. 8vo, Mons, 1702. This book also (which was written by Perault, brother of Charles Perault, who began the famous dispute, whether the moderns were inferior or superior to the ancients) was burnt at Paris in 1670, at the instigation of the Jesuits. *Œuvres du P. Daniel*, i. 356, &c. And there was good reason: for, whoever shall read this book, will there see all the faults that were charged upon the Jesuitical writers on morals. That the Jesuits actually put their moral principles in practice, especially in foreign and remote

and Jansenists, but also the divines of Paris, Poitiers, Louvain, and others in great numbers, so pointedly reprobated in public, that *Alexander VII.* thought it advisable to condemn a part of them in his decree of the 21st of August, 1659; and *Alexander VIII.*, on the 24th of August, 1690, condemned particularly the philosophical sin of the Jesuits.¹ But these numerous and respectable decisions and decrees against the moral principles of the Jesuits, if we may believe the common voice of learned and pious men, were more efficacious in restraining the horrid licentiousness of the writers of this society, than in purging their schools of these abominable principles. Nor does general opinion assign any other reason why kings, nobles, and so many people of every rank and sex, prefer Jesuits for the care of their souls, than because they hear precepts from them which extenuate sins, pamper wicked lusts, and open a most accommodating way to heaven.²

§ 35. The holy Scriptures were so far from receiving an increase of reverence and authority from the pontiffs, that, on the contrary, in most countries, the friends of the papal cause, and especially the Jesuits, as appears from the best evidence, took great pains to

countries, Antony Arnauld, with his Jansenist associates, undertook to prove, in an elaborate work, entitled, *La Morale Pratique des Jésuites*; which gradually appeared, during the last century, in 8 volumes; and when copies of it became scarce, it was re-published, Amsterdam, 1742, 8 vols. 8vo, with numerous additional proofs of the charges against the Jesuits. Respecting philosophical sin, in particular, and the commotions that arose from it, see James Hyacinth Serry (or rather Augustus le Blanc), in his *Addenda ad Historiam Congregationum de auxiliis*, p. 82, &c., and in his *Auctarium to these Addenda*, p. 289, &c.

¹ The history of the commotions in France, and in other places, arising from these opinions of the Jesuits respecting morality, was neatly drawn up by the writer of the *Catéchisme Historique et Dogmatique sur les Contestations qui divisent maintenant l'Eglise*; 1730, 8vo, ii. 26, &c. The *Bulls* here mentioned are sought for in vain in the *Bullarium Pontificum*. But the care of the Dominicans and Jansenists to preserve everything disreputable to Jesuits, would not suffer them to be lost.

² What is here said of the very gross errors of the Jesuits, should not be understood to imply, that all the members of this society cherish these opinions, or that the public schools of the order echo with them. For this fraternity embraces very many persons, who are both learned and ingenuous, and by no means bad men. Nor would it be difficult to fill several volumes with citations from the writings of Jesuits,

in which a much purer virtue and piety are taught, than that black and deformed system, which Pascal and the others present to us from the Casuists, Summists, and Moralists of this order. Those who accuse the Jesuits as a body, if candid, can mean only, that the leaders of the society both permit such impious sentiments to be publicly set forth by individuals, and give their approbation and countenance to the books in which such sentiments are taught; that the system of religion which is taught here and there in their schools, is so lax and disjointed, that it easily leads men to such pernicious conclusions; and, finally, that the small select number, who are initiated in the greater mysteries of the order, and who are employed in public stations and in guiding the minds of the great, commonly make use of such principles to advance the interests and augment the wealth of the society. I would also acknowledge, since ingenuousness is the prime virtue of an historian, that in exaggerating the turpitude of some Jesuitical opinions, some of their adversaries have been over-eloquent and vehement; as might easily be shown, if there were opportunity, in regard to the doctrines of *probability*, *mental reservation* in oaths, and some others. For in this, as in most other disputes and controversies respecting either sacred or secular subjects, the accused were charged with the consequences which their accusers deduced from their declarations, their words were made to express more than they intended, and the limitations they contemplated to their opinions were overlooked.

prevent them from coming into the hands of the people, and from being interpreted otherwise than as the convenience of the church required. Among the French and the Belgians there were some who might not improperly be denominated learned and intelligent expositors; but the majority of those who pretended to expound the sacred writings, rather obscured and darkened the divine oracles by their comments, than elucidated them. And in this class must be placed even the Jansenists; who, though they treated the Bible with more respect than others of their church, yet strangely adulterated the word of God by the frigid allegories and recondite expositions of the ancient doctors.¹ Yet we ought to except *Paschasius Quesnel*, one of the fathers of the Oratory, who published the *New Testament* illustrated with pious meditations and observations, which has in our day been the prolific cause of so many disputes, commotions, and divisions.²

§ 36. Nearly all the schools retained the old method of teaching theology; which was dry, thorny, and by no means suited to men of liberal minds. Not even the decrees of the pontiffs could bring *dogmatic* or *biblical theology* to be in equal estimation with *scholastic*. For in most of the chairs the *scholastic* doctors were fixed; and they perplexed and depressed the *biblical* divines, who were generally not well acquainted with the arts of wrangling. The *mystics* were wholly excluded from the schools; and unless they were very cautious and submissive to the church, could scarcely escape the brand of heresy. Yet many of the French, and among them the followers of *Jansen* especially, explained the principal doctrines of Christianity in a neat and lucid style. In like manner, nearly all that was written judiciously and elegantly, respecting piety and morality, came from the pens either of the *Messieurs de Port-Royal*, as the Jansenists were usually called, or from the French *Fathers of the Oratory*. Of the change in the manner of conducting theological controversies, we

¹ Very well known, even among us, is the Bible of Isaac le Maître, commonly called Sacy; which comprehends nearly everything with which the heated imaginations of the ancient doctors disfigured the simplest narrations and the clearest statements of the sacred volume. [It is also called the Translation of Mons, because it was first printed there in 1665. It was commenced by Sacy, a very zealous Jansenist, who died in 1664, and completed by Thomas du Fossé. It is founded on the Vulgate; yet here and there deviates from it. The archbishop of Paris, Perefex, soon after it appeared, in 1667, published a severe circular, forbidding it to be read. The same thing was done by Ge. Aubusson, bishop of Embrun: the Jesuits also did not remain idle: and at last, in 1668, Clement IX. condemned it, as a perverse and dangerous translation, that deviated from the Vulgate, and was a stone of stum-

bling to the simple. This censure it by no means merited: and even Mosheim's censure is applicable only to the notes, which are taken chiefly from the fathers, and are very mystical. *Schl.*]

² The first part, containing notes on the four Gospels, was published in 1671; and being received with great applause, it was republished, enlarged, and amended, together with notes on the other books of the New Testament. See *Catéchisme Historique sur les Contestations de l'Eglise*, ii. 150. Christ. Eberh. Weismann's *Historia Eccles. sæc. xvii.* p. 588, &c. and numerous others. [Quesnel, in his translation, followed that of Sacy; though, to avoid all offence, he kept closer to the Vulgate. Most of the notes relate entirely to practical religion. The contests produced by the work belong to the history of the eighteenth century. *Schl.*]

have already spoken. The Germans, the Belgians, and the French, having learned to their disadvantage that the angry, loose, and capitious mode of disputing, which their fathers pursued, rather confirmed than weakened the faith and resolution of dissentients, and that the arguments on which their doctors formerly placed much reliance had lost nearly all their force, thought it necessary for them to look round for new methods of warfare, and such as had a greater appearance of wisdom.

§ 37. The minor controversies of the schools, and of the religious orders which divide the Roman church, we shall pass over: for the pontiffs, for the most part, disregard them; or if at any time they become too violent, they are easily suppressed with a nod or a mandate; neither are these skirmishes, which perpetually exist, of such a nature as seriously to endanger the welfare of the church. It will be sufficient to recite briefly those controversies which affected seriously the whole church. Among these, the first place is due to the contests between the Dominicans and the Jesuits respecting the nature of divine grace and its necessity to salvation; the cognisance of which *Clement VIII.*, at the close of the preceding century, had committed to some select theologians.¹ These, after some years of consultation and attention to the arguments of the parties, signified to the pontiff, not obscurely, that the doctrines of the Dominicans respecting grace, predestination, man's ability to do good, and the inherent corruption of our nature, were nearer to the sense of holy Scripture, and of the ancient doctors, than the opinions of *Molina*, whom the Jesuits supported: that the tendency of the former was towards the principles laid down by *Augustine*, that of the latter towards the reprobated positions of *Pelagius*. Wherefore, in the year 1601, *Clement* seemed ready to pronounce sentence against the Jesuits, and in favour of the Dominicans. The Jesuits, however, perceiving their cause to be in such imminent peril, so besieged the aged pontiff, sometimes with threats, sometimes with complaints, and at others with arguments, that in the year 1602 he resolved to give the whole of this knotty controversy a rehearing, and to assume to himself the office of presiding judge. The pontiff accordingly presided over this trial during three years, or from the 20th of March, 1602, till the 22nd of January, 1605, having for assessors fifteen cardinals, nine theologians, and five bishops; and he held seventy-eight sessions, or *Congregations*, as they are denominated at Rome;² in which he patiently listened to the disputations of the Jesuits and the Dominicans, and caused their arguments to be carefully weighed and examined. To what results he came is uncertain; for he was cut off by death on the 4th of March, 1605, when just ready to pronounce sentence. If we may believe the Dominicans, he was prepared to condemn *Molina* in a public decree; but if we believe the Jesuits, he would have acquitted him of all error. Which of them is to be believed, no one can deter-

¹ [See the preceding century, sect. iii. ch. i. § 40, 41. *Tr.*]

² [*Congregationes de Auxiliis*; sc. *gratiæ* in the Romish style. *Tr.*]

mine, without inspecting the records of the trial, which are kept carefully concealed at Rome.

§ 38. *Paul V.*, the successor of *Clement*, ordered the judges, in the month of September, 1605, to resume their inquiries and deliberations, which had been suspended. They obeyed his mandate, and had frequent discussions, until the month of March in the next year; debating, not so much on the merits of the question, which had been sufficiently examined, as on the mode of terminating the contest. For it was debated whether it would be for the interests of the church to have this dispute decided by a public decree of the pontiff: and if it were, then what should be the form and phraseology of the decree. The issue of this protracted business was, that the whole contest came to nothing, as is frequent at Rome, or, that it was decided neither way, but each party was left free to retain its own sentiments. The Dominicans maintain that *Paul V.*, and the theologians to whom he committed the investigation, equally with *Clement* before him, perceived the holiness and justice of *their* cause; and they tell us, a severe decree against the doctrines of the Jesuits was actually drawn up, and sealed by his order; but that the unhappy war with the Venetians, which broke out at that time, and of which we have already given an account, prevented the publication of the decree. On the contrary, the Jesuits contend, that all this is false; and that the pontiff, with the wisest of the theologians, after examining the whole cause, judged the sentiments of *Molina* to contain nothing which much needed correction. It is far more probable that *Paul* was deterred from passing sentence by fear of the kings of France and Spain; of whom the former patronised the cause of the Jesuits, and the latter that of the Dominicans. And if he had published a decision, it would undoubtedly have been not unlike those usually promulgated at Rome, that is, ambiguous, and not wholly adverse to either of the contending parties.¹

¹ The writers already quoted on this subject, may be consulted here. Also Jo. le Clerc, *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire des Controverses dans l'Eglise Romaine sur la Prédestination et sur la Grâce*; in the *Bibliothèque Universelle et Historique*, xiv. 234, &c. The conduct of both the Jesuits and the Dominicans, after this controversy was put to rest, affords grounds for a suspicion, that both parties were privately admonished by the pontiff, to temper and regulate in some measure their respective doctrines, so that the former might no longer be taxed with Pelagianism, nor the latter with coinciding with the Calvinists. For Claudius Aquaviva, the general of the order of Jesuits, in a circular letter addressed to the whole fraternity, Dec. 14th, 1613. very cautiously modifies the doctrine of *Molina*, and commands his brethren to teach everywhere, that God gratuitously, and without any regard to their merits,

from all eternity, elected those to salvation whom he wished to be partakers of it; yet they must so teach this, as by no means to give up what the Jesuits had maintained in their disputes with the Dominicans, respecting the nature of divine grace: and these two things, which seem to clash with each other, he thinks may be conveniently reconciled, by means of that divine knowledge, which is called *scientia media* [foreknowledge of the free actions of men]. See *Catéchisme Historique sur les Contestations de l'Eglise*, i. 207. On the contrary, the Dominicans, though holding substantially the same sentiments as before this controversy arose, yet greatly obscure and disfigure their sentiments, by using words and distinctions borrowed from the schools of the Jesuits; so that not even a Jesuit can now tax them with having the mark of Calvinism. They are also much more slow to oppose the Jesuits; recollecting, doubtless,

§ 39. The wounds which seemed thus healed were again torn open, to the great damage of the Roman catholic interest, when the book of *Cornelius Jansen*, bishop of Ypres in the Netherlands, was published after his death, in 1640, under the title of *Augustinus*.¹ In this book (the author of which is allowed, even by the Jesuits, to have been a learned and grave man, and, apparently at least, devout), the opinions of *Augustine* respecting the native depravity of man and the nature and influence of that grace, by which alone this depravity can be cured, are stated and explained; and, for the most part, in the very words of *Augustine*. For it was not the object of *Jansen*, as he tells us himself, to show what ought to be believed on these subjects, but merely what *Augustine* believed.² But, as the doctrine of *Augustine* (which differed little from that of *St. Thomas* [*Aquinas*], which was embraced by the Dominicans) was accounted almost sacred and divine, in the Roman church, on account of the high character and merits of the author of it; and, at the same time, was almost diametrically opposite to the common sentiments of the Jesuits; this work of *Jansen* could not but appear to them as a silent although a most effectual confutation of their sentiments. Hence, they not

their former perils, and their immense labours undertaken in vain. This change of conduct, the Jansenists severely charge upon them, as being a manifest and great defection from divine truth. See Blaise Pascal's *Lettres Provinciales*, t. i. lett. ii. p. 27, &c. Yet their ill-will against the Jesuits is by no means laid aside: nor can the Dominicans (among whom many are greatly dissatisfied with the cautious prudence of their order) easily keep themselves quiet, whenever a good opportunity occurs for exercising their resentments. With the Dominicans, in this cause at least, the Augustinians are in harmony (for the opinions of *St. Thomas*, in respect to grace, do not much differ from those of *Augustine*): and the most learned man they have, *Henry Noris* (in his *Vindiciæ Augustiniane*, c. vi. *Opp.* i. 1175), laments that he is not at liberty, in consequence of the pope's decree, to let the world know what was transacted in the *Congregationes de Auxiliis* against *Molina* and the Jesuits, and in favour of *Augustine*. He says: 'Quando, recentiori Romano decreto id vetitum est, cum dispendio causæ, quam defendo, necessariam defensionem omitto.'

¹ For an account of this famous man, see Bayle's *Dictionnaire*, ii. 1529. Melchior Leydecker, *de Vita et Morte Jansenii*, libri iii. constituting the first part of his *Historia Jansenismi*, published at Utrecht, 1695, 8vo. *Dictionnaire des Livres Jansenistes*, i. 120, &c. and many others. This celebrated work, which gave a mortal wound to the Romish community, which all the power and all the sagacity of the vicar of Jesus

Christ were unable to heal, is divided into three parts. The first is historical, and narrates the origination of the Pelagian contests in the fifth century: the second investigates and explains the doctrine of *Augustine*, concerning the state and powers of human nature, before the fall, as fallen, and as renewed. The third traces out his opinions concerning the assistance of Christ by his renewing grace, and the predestination of men and angels. The language is sufficiently clear and perspicuous, but not so correct as it should be. [*Jansen* was born at a village near Leerdam, in Flanders, A.D. 1585, educated at Louvain, where he became principal of the college of *St. Pulcheria*, doctor of theology in 1617, and professor in ordinary. He was twice sent by the university of Louvain to the Spanish court, to manage their affairs. His political work against France, entitled *Mars Gallicus*, procured him favour at the court of Spain, and he was appointed bishop of Ypres in 1635. He died in 1638, of a contagion, taken by visiting his flock labouring under it. His *Augustinus*, in 3 vols. fol., cost him 20 years' labour. He also wrote against the protestants. *Tr.*]

² Thus *Jansen*, in his *Augustinus*, t. ii. Introductory Book, c. xxix. p. 65, says: 'Non ego hic de nova aliqua sententia rependienda disputo—sed de antiqua Augustini. —Quæritur, non quid de naturæ humanæ statibus et viribus, vel de Dei gratia et prædestinatione sentiendum sit: sed quid Augustinus olim ecclesiæ nomine et applausu —tradiderit, prædicaverit, scriptoque multipliciter consignaverit.'

only attacked it with their own writings, but also instigated the pontiff, *Urban VIII.*, to condemn it. Nor were their efforts unsuccessful. First, the inquisitors at Rome, in 1641, prohibited the reading of it; and then, in 1642, *Urban* himself, in a public decree, pronounced it contaminated with several errors long since rejected by the church.

§ 40. The Jesuits and the Roman edicts were opposed by the doctors of Louvain, and by the other admirers of *Augustine*, who were always very numerous in the Low Countries. Hence there arose an extremely embarrassing, and, to the Belgic provinces, a most mischievous controversy.¹ It had scarcely commenced when it spread into the neighbouring France; where *John du Vergier de Hauranne*, abbot of *St. Cyran* or *Sigeran*, an intimate friend of *Jansen*, a man of an accomplished and elegant mind, and no less respected for the purity of his morals and the sanctity of his life than for his erudition, had already inspired great numbers with attachment to *Augustine* and hatred of the Jesuits.² The greatest part of the learned in this most flourishing kingdom had connected themselves with the Jesuits, because their doctrines were more grateful to human nature, and better accorded with the nature of the Romish religion and the interests of that church, than the Augustinian principles. But the opposite party embraced, besides some bishops of high reputation for piety, the men of the best and most cultivated minds almost throughout France: *Antony Arnauld*, *Peter Nicole*, *Blaise Pascal*, *Paschasius Quesnel*, and the numerous other famous and excellent men, who are denominated the *Port-Royal authors*; likewise a great number of those who looked on the vulgar piety of the Roman church, which is confined to the confession of sins, frequent attendance on the Lord's Supper, and some external works, as far short of what Christ requires of his followers; and who believed that the soul of a Christian, who would be accounted truly pious, ought to be full of genuine faith and love to God. Thus, as the one party had the advantage of numbers

¹ [The principal adherents to Jansen in the Netherlands, were James Boonen, the archbishop of Mechlin; Libertus Fromond, a pupil, friend, and successor of Jansen, in the professorial chair at Louvain; and Henry Calen, a canon of Mechlin, and arch-priest of Brussels. *Schl.*]

² He is esteemed by all the Jansenists, as highly as Jansen himself; and he is said to have aided Jansen in composing his *Augustinus*. The French especially, who are partial to the doctrines of Augustine, reverence him as a father and an oracle, and extol him above Jansen himself. His life and history have been duly written by Claude Lancelot, *Mémoires touchant la Vie de M. S. Cyran*; published at Cologne (or rather at Utrecht), 1738, 2 vols. 8vo. Add the *Recueil de plusieurs Pièces pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, p. 1—150. Utrecht, 1740, 8vo. Arnaud d'Andilly,

Mémoires au sujet de l'Abbé de S. Cyran; printed in the *Vies des Religieuses de Port-Royal*, i. 15—44. Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, ii. [p. 531, artic. *Garasse*, note D. Tr.] *Dictionnaire des Livres Jansénistes*, i. 133, &c. See also, respecting his early studies, Gabriel Liron, *Singularités Histor. et Littér.* iv. 507, &c. [Jo. du Vergier de Hauranne was born at Bayonne, in 1581, became abbot of St. Cyran in 1620, was thrown into prison by Richelieu in 1638, released in 1643, and died the same year, aged 62. He held much the same sentiments with Jansen, and spread them extensively by conversation. His works are: *Somme des Fautes*, &c. de Garasse (a Jesuit writer), 3 vols. 4to: *Spiritual Letters*, 2 vols. 4to: *Apology for Roche-Posay*, &c. and *Question Royale*. Tr.—See also C. Beard's *Port-Royal*, London, 1861, p. 121, &c. Ed.]

and power, and the other that of talent and pious fervour, it is not difficult to understand why this controversy is still kept up, although it is now a whole century since its commencement.¹

§ 41. The attentive reader of this protracted contest will be amused to see the artifices and stratagems with which the one party conducted their attack, and the other their defence. The Jesuits came forth, armed with decrees of the pontiff, mandates of the king, the most odious comparisons, the support of great men, the good-will of most of the bishops, and, lastly, force and bayonets. The Jansenists overthrew those decrees and mandates by the most subtle distinctions and interpretations, nay, by the same sophistry which they condemned in the Jesuits; odious comparisons they destroyed by other comparisons equally odious: to the menaces of great men and bishops they opposed the favour of the multitude; and physical force they vanquished by divine power, that is, by the miracles of which they boasted. Perceiving that their adversaries were not to be overcome by the soundest arguments and proofs, they endeavoured to conciliate the favour of the pontiffs, and of the people at large, by their meritorious and splendid deeds, and by their great industry. Hence they attacked spiritedly those enemies of the church, the protestants, and endeavoured to circumvent them with contrivances and sophisms that were entirely new: applied themselves to the education of youth of all classes, and imbued them with the elements of the liberal arts and sciences; they composed very neat and elegant treatises on grammar, philosophy, and the other branches of learning; they gained a hold upon the highest, the middle, the lowest walks of life, by devotional and practical treatises composed in the most elegant manner; they hit upon a style, pure, easy, agreeable, and translated with uncommon skill not a few of the ancient writers: and lastly, they sought to persuade, and actually did persuade, very many to believe that God himself espoused their cause, and had, by many prodigies and miracles, placed the truth of the Augustinian doctrine beyond all controversy.²

¹ The history of this controversy is to be found entire, or in part, in a great number of books. The following may supersede all the rest: Gabriel Gerberon, *Histoire Générale du Jansénisme*, Amsterd. 1700, 3 vols. 8vo, and Lyons, 1708, 5 vols. 12mo. The Abbé du Mas (a senator of Paris, who died 1722), *Histoire des cinq Propositions de Jansenius*, Liege, 1694, 8vo. Du Mas favours the Jesuits; Gerberon favours the Jansenists. Michael Leydecker, *Historia Jansenismi*, libri vi. Utrecht, 1695, 8vo. Voltaire, *Siècle de Louis XIV.* ii. 264, &c. Many books on this subject, by both parties, are mentioned in the *Bibliothèque Janséniste, ou Catalogue Alphabétique des principaux Livres Jansénistes*, published in 1735, 8vo, and said to be the work of Dominic Colonia, a learned Jesuit. See *Recueil des Pièces pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, p. 325, &c. But, as already remarked, this

book, much enlarged, appeared under the title of *Dictionnaire des Livres Jansénistes*, Antw. 1752, 4 vols. 8vo.

² That the Jansenists or Augustinians have long resorted to miracles, in support of their cause, is very well known. And they themselves confess that they have been saved from ruin, when nearly in despair, by means of miracles. See *Mémoires de Port-Royal*, i. 256, ii. 107. The first of these miracles were those said to have been performed, in the convent of Port-Royal, from 1656, onwards, in the cure of several afflicted persons, by means of a thorn from that crown which the Roman soldiers placed on the head of our most holy Saviour. See *Recueil de plusieurs Pièces pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, p. 228, 448. Fontaine, *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, ii. 131, &c. Other miracles followed in 1661. *Vies des Religieuses de*

As all these things have great influence with mankind, they often rendered the victory of the Jesuits quite dubious; and perhaps the Jansenists would have triumphed if the cause of the Jesuits had not been the cause of the church; the safety of which depends, in a great measure, on those opinions which the Jesuits approve.

§ 42. Various circumstances lead to the conclusion that *Urban VIII.*, and afterwards *Innocent X.*, were desirous of suppressing these dangerous commotions in their commencement; as the former pontiffs had wisely suppressed the contests between *Baius* and the Dominicans. But they were unable to do it in consequence of the highly excitable and fervid tempers of the French. The adversaries of the Augustinian doctrines extracted from the work of *Jansen* five propositions which were thought to be the worst; and instigated especially by the Jesuits, they never ceased from urging *Innocent* to condemn them. A large part of the French clergy most earnestly resisted such a measure by representatives whom they sent to Rome, and wisely suggested that it was of the first importance to distinguish the different constructions that might be put upon those propositions, since they were ambiguous, and would admit of a true as well as a false interpretation. But *Innocent X.*, overcome by the incessant and importunate clamours of the Jesuits, without maturely considering the case, hastily condemned those propositions in a public edict, dated May 31st, 1653. The substance of the *first* proposition was: That there are some commands of God, which righteous and good men are absolutely unable to obey, though disposed to do it; and that God does not give them so much grace that they are able to observe them. —*Secondly*: That no person in this corrupt state of nature *can* resist

Port-Royal, i. 192; and in 1664; *Mémoires de Port-Royal*, iii. 252. The fame of these miracles was great, and very useful to the Augustinians, in the seventeenth century; but at present it is quite hushed. In our age, therefore, when hard pressed, they have resisted the fury of their enemies by new and more numerous prodigies. If we may believe them, the first occurred on the 31st of May, 1725, in the person of a certain woman named *De la Fosse*; who was suddenly cured of a bloody flux, when she had supplicated relief, from a host carried by a priest of the Jansenian party. Two years afterwards, in 1727, the tomb of *Gerhard Rouse*, a canon of *Avignon*, was ennobled by very splendid miracles. Lastly, in 1731, the bones of *Francis De Paris* [commonly called the *Deacon Paris*], which were interred at *St. Medard*, were famed for numberless miracles: and what warm disputes there have been, and still are, respecting these, every one knows. It is also said, that *Paschasius Quesnel*, *Levier*, *Desangins*, and *Tournus*, those great ornaments of the sect, have often afforded relief to the sick, who relied on their merits and intercession. See *Jésus-Christ sous*

l'Anathème et sous l'Excommunication; a celebrated Jansenist book, written against the Bull *Unigenitus*, art. xvii. p. 61, art. xviii. p. 66, ed. Utrecht. A great part of the Jansenists contend for the reality of these miracles, with good faith: for this sect abounds with persons who are by no means corrupt, but whose piety is unenlightened, and to whom the truth and divinity of their cause appear so manifest, that they readily believe it cannot possibly be neglected by the Deity. But it is incredible that so many persons of distinguished penetration, as formerly were, and still are, followers of this sect, should not know that the powers of nature, or the operation of medicines, or the influence of the imagination, accomplished these cures, which deceivers, or men blinded by party zeal, have ascribed to the almighty power of God. Such persons, therefore, must be of the opinion, that it is lawful to promote a holy and righteous cause, by means of deceptions, and to take advantage of the misapprehensions of the multitude, in order to confirm the truth.

divine grace operating upon the mind.—*Thirdly*: That in order to earn praise or blame before God, a man has no occasion to be exempt from necessity, but only from coercion.—*Fourthly*: That the Semi-Pelagians erred greatly by supposing that the human will has the power both of admitting and of rejecting the operations of internal preventing grace.—*Fifthly*: That whoever affirms that Jesus Christ made expiation by his sufferings and death for the sins of *all* mankind, is a Semi-Pelagian.—The first four of these propositions *Innocent* pronounced to be directly heretical; but the fifth, he declared to be only rash, irreligious, and injurious to God.¹

§ 43. This sentence of the supreme ecclesiastical judge was indeed painful and perplexing to the friends of *Jansen*, and grateful and agreeable to their enemies; yet it did not fully satisfy the latter nor entirely dishearten the former. For *Jansen* himself had escaped condemnation; the pontiff not having declared that the heretical propositions were to be found in his *Augustinus* in that sense in which they were condemned. The *Augustinians*, therefore, under the guidance of the very acute *Antony Arnauld*, distinguished in this controversy between the *point of law* and the *point of fact* (*questionem juris* and *questionem facti*); that is, they maintained that we ought to believe those propositions to be justly condemned by the pontiff; but that it was not necessary to believe, nor had the pontiff required a belief, that those propositions were to be found in *Jansen's* book in that sense in which they were condemned.² Yet they were not allowed to enjoy this consolation long, for the pertinacious hatred of the adverse party drove *Alexander VII.*, the successor of *Clement*, to such a height of imprudence, that he not only declared, in a new Bull of the 16th of October, 1656, that the condemned propositions were those of *Jansen*, and were to be found in his book, but he moreover, in the year 1665, sent into France the formula of an oath, which was to be subscribed by all who would enjoy any office in the church, and which affirmed that the five condemned propositions were actually to be found in *Jansen's* book, in the very sense in which they had been condemned by the church.³ This imprudent step, which appeared intolerable not only to the Jansenists, but likewise to the better

¹ This Bull is extant, in the *Bullarium Romanum*, vi. 486. It is also published, together with many public Acts relating to this subject, by Charles du Plessis d'Argentre, in his *Collectio Judiciorum de novis Erroribus*, t. iii. pt. ii. p. 261, &c. [Mosheim mistook, in regard to the sentence pronounced on the several propositions. The Bull says of the *first*: 'Temerariam, impiam, blasphemam, anathemate damnatam, et hæreticam declaramus, et uti talem damnamus.' Of the *second* and the *third*, it says simply: 'Hæreticam declaramus, et uti talem damnamus.' Of the *fourth*, it says: 'Falsam et hæreticam declaramus, et uti talem damnamus.' And of the *fifth*, it says: 'Falsam, temerariam, scandalosam, et in-

tellectam eo sensu, ut Christus pro salute dumtaxat prædestinatorum mortuus sit: Impiam, blasphemam, contumeliosam, divinæ pietati derogantem, et hæreticam declaramus, et uti talem damnamus.' So that the sentence on the *fifth* proposition was the most severe; and that on the *first*, next to it in severity. *Tr.*]

² *Dictionnaire des Livres Jansénistes*, i. 249, ii. 7, &c.

³ This Bull also, together with various documents, is in Charles du Plessis d'Argentre's *Collectio Judiciorum de novis Erroribus*, t. iii. pt. ii. p. 281—288, 306. The *Formula* of the oath, by *Alexander VII.*, occurs *ibid.* p. 314, together with the ordinance of the king and other papers.

part of the French clergy, was followed by immense commotions and contests. The Jansenists immediately contended, that the pontiff might err, especially when pronouncing an opinion without the presence of a council, in all questions of *fact*; and therefore that they were not under obligation to subscribe to that formula which required that they should swear to a matter of fact; the Jesuits, on the contrary, had the boldness publicly to maintain, in the city of Paris, that the pope's infallibility was equally certain and divine, in matters of fact, as in contested points of ecclesiastical law. Some of the Jansenists would not undertake either to condemn or approve the formula; but they promised, by observing silence, to show respect to the authority of the head of the church. Others appeared ready to subscribe with some explanation or distinction, oral or written, annexed; but by no means without qualification. Others attempted other modes of evasion.¹ But none of these courses would satisfy the impassioned mind of the Jesuits; and therefore the recusants were miserably harassed with banishment, imprisonment, and other vexations, the Jesuits having the control and guidance of the measures of the court.

§ 44. The lenity or the prudence of *Clement IX.*, in the year 1669, gave some respite to the persecuted party, who defended *Augustine* to their own loss and injury. This was occasioned by four French bishops, those of Angers, Beauvais, Pamiers, and Alet, who courageously declared that they could not conscientiously subscribe to the prescribed oath, without adding some explanation. And when the Roman court threatened them with punishment, nineteen other bishops espoused their cause; and addressed letters in their behalf, both to the king and to the pontiff. These were also joined by *Anne Geneviève de Bourbon*, a lady of great heroism, and, after her renunciation of the allurements and pleasures of the world, a warm friend of the Jansenists, who very urgently besought *Clement IX.* to assume more moderation. Influenced by entreaties and arguments so numerous and of so much weight, *Clement* consented, that such as chose might subscribe the oath above mentioned, annexing an exposition of their own views. Upon this liberty being allowed, the former tranquillity returned; and the friends of *Jansen*, now freed from all fear, lived securely in their own country. This celebrated event is usually called the *peace of Clement IX.* But it was not of long continuance.² For

¹ See Du Mas, *Histoire des cinq Propositions*, p. 158, &c. Gerberon, *Histoire Générale du Jansénisme*, pt. ii. p. 516, and many others.

² The transactions relative to this subject, under the pontificate of *Clement IX.* are fully narrated, by cardinal Rospigliosi, in the *Commentaries*; which Charles du Plessis d'Argentre has subjoined to his *Elementa Theologica*, Paris, 1716, 8vo, and which are also extant, in the *Collectio Judiciorum de novis Erroribus*, t. iii. pt. ii. p. 336, where likewise are the letters of *Clement IX.* Among the Jansenists, the history of the

peace of *Clement IX.* has been expressly written by Varet, the vicar of the archbishop of Sens (for the *Catéchisme Historique sur les Contestations de l'Eglise*, i. 352, testifies that Varet wrote the anonymous history); *Relation de ce qui s'est passé dans l'affaire de la Paix de l'Eglise sous le Pape Clément IX.* 1706, 12mo, and by Paschasius Quesnel (whom Dominic Colonia, among others, *Biblioth. Janséniste*, p. 314, declares to have been the author), in his book, *La Paix de Clément IX. ou Démonstration des deux Faussetés capitales avancées dans l'Histoire des cinq Propositions contre la Foi des Dis-*

the king of France, at the instigation of the Jesuits, disturbed it by his edict of 1676; in which he represented it as granted only for a time, in condescension to the weak consciences of certain persons; and on the death of *Anne de Bourbon*, in 1679, it was wholly subverted. From this time the Augustinian party was harassed with the same injuries and persecutions as before; which some avoided by a voluntary exile; others endured with fortitude and magnanimity; and others warded off by such means as they could. The head and leader of the sect, *Antony Arnauld*,¹ to avoid the fury of his enemies, fled in the year 1679 into the Low Countries, to the great injury of the Jesuits. For this man, possessing extraordinary eloquence and acuteness of mind, instilled his doctrines into the minds of the greatest part of the Belgians; and also induced that portion of the Roman church which is situated among the Dutch to join the Jansenist party, by the influence of *John Neercassel*, bishop of Castoria, and *Peter Codde*, archbishop of Sebaste.² This Dutch church remains to the present day firmly fixed in its purpose, and being safe under the powerful protection of the Dutch government, it despises the indignation of the pontiffs, which it incurs in a very high degree.

§ 45. The Jansenists, or as they wished to be called, *Augustinians*, were so very odious to the Jesuits, not merely on account of their doctrine respecting divine grace (which was in reality the Augustinian doctrine, and almost identical with that of the followers of *Calvin*, only differently coloured and displayed), but there were many other things in them which the defenders of the Roman church cannot approve and tolerate. For it was under Jansenist leaders that all those contests in the Roman church, which we have mentioned above, originated, and have been continued down to our times, in numberless publications printed in the Low Countries and in France.³ But there is hardly anything in them which the Jesuits and the loyal subjects of the Roman pontiffs regard as more intolerable than the system of morals and of practical piety which they inculcate. For in the view

ciples de S. Augustin: Chambéry, or rather Brussels, 1701, 2 vols. 12mo. The following work, *Relation de ce qui s'est passé dans l'affaire de la Paix de l'Eglise sous le Pape Clément IX., avec les Lettres, Actes, Mémoires, et autres Pièces qui y ont rapport*; without mention of the place, 1706, 2 vols. 8vo, is an accurately written history. The part which Anne de Bourbon took in this business is elegantly narrated by Villefort, in his *Vie d'Anne Geneviève de Bourbon, Duchesse de Longueville*, t. ii. l. vi. p. 89, ed. Amsterd. 1739, 8vo, which is much fuller than the Paris edition.

¹ For an account of this great man see Bayle, *Dictionnaire* [art. *Arnauld*], tom. i. p. 337, and *Histoire Abrégée de la Vie et des Ouvrages de M. Arnaud*; Cologne, 1695, 8vo. On the transition of the Dutch church to the Jansenist party, see Lafitau, *Vie de Clément IX.* tom. i. p. 123, &c. Respecting

Codde, Neercassel, Varlet, and other defenders of the Jansenist cause in Holland, see *Dictionnaire des Livres Jansénistes*, i. 48, 121, 353, ii. 406, iv. 119, &c. and in many other places.

² [Both sees *in partibus*. S. — This church, properly speaking, the church of Holland, still exists under an archbishop and two bishops. It has, however, long ceased to enjoy the support of the civil government. Pope Pius IX., by the Bull *Ex qua die*, in 1853, established a new Roman hierarchy. The archbishop of Utrecht and the bishops of Deventer and Haarlem protested in 1854 against the Bull *Ineffabilis*, which established the Immaculate Conception. See J. M. Neale, *Jansenist Church of Holland*, London, 1858. *Ed.*]

³ See above, century xvi. History of the Roman church, § 31, &c.

of the Jansenists there is nothing entirely sound and uncorrupted in the practice and institutions of the Roman church. In the first place, they complain that the whole body of the clergy have forsaken altogether the duties of their office. They moreover assert, that the monks are really apostates; and they would have them be brought back to their pristine sanctity, and to that strict course of life which the founders of the several orders prescribed. They would also have the people well instructed in the knowledge of religion and Christian piety. They contend that the sacred volume, and the books containing the forms of public worship, should be put into the hands of the people in the vernacular tongue of each nation, and should be diligently read and studied by all. And lastly, they assert that all the people should be carefully taught that true piety towards God does not consist in external acts and rites, but in purity of heart and divine love. These things considered in a general view, no one can censure, unless he is himself vicious, or a stranger to the principles of Christianity. But if we descend to particulars, and inquire how they trained their people for heaven, it will appear that Jansenian piety leaned greatly towards insupportable superstition and the harsh and fanatical opinions of the so-called mystics; and, therefore, that it is not entirely without reason they were branded by their adversaries with the title of *Rigorists*.¹ Their doctrine respecting penitence especially was

¹ Those who wish for a fuller knowledge of that gloomy piety, which the Jansenists commonly prescribed to their people, and which was indeed coincident with the pattern set by those that anciently inhabited the desert parts of Egypt, Libya, and Syria, but was equally remote from the prescriptions of Christ and of right reason, may read only the *Letters*, and the other writings of the abbot of St. Cyran, whom the Jansenists regard almost as an oracle. He may be called a frank, ingenuous man, sincere in his intercourse with God, superior to most teachers of piety among the Romanists; he may also be called a learned man, and very well acquainted with the opinions and the affairs of the ancients: but, with the Jansenists, to pronounce him the greatest and best, the perfect pattern of holiness, and the most correct teacher of true piety, is what no one can do, unless he affix new meanings to these terms, and meanings unknown in the sacred writings. That we may not seem to do injustice to so great a man, we will confirm these remarks by some specimens of his wisdom and virtue. This honest man undertook, in a long work, to confute the *heretics*, that is, the protestants. And for this purpose it was necessary for him to examine the books written by this wicked class of men. But before he proceeded to read any of them, with Martin de Barcos, his nephew, a man very like to his uncle, he was accustomed to expel the devil

out of them by the sign of the cross. What weakness did this manifest? This very holy man, forsooth, was persuaded, that the enemy of mankind had taken up his residence in these writings of the heretics: but it is difficult to tell where he supposed the arch-fiend to lie concealed, whether in the paper or in the letters, or between the leaves, or lastly, in the sentiments themselves. Let us hear Claude Lancelot, in his *Mémoires touchant la Vie de M. l'Abbé de St. Cyran*, i. 226. He says: 'il lisoit ces livres avec tant de piété, qu'en les prenant il les exorcisoit toujours en faisant le signe de la croix dessus, ne doutant point que le Démon n'y résidoit actuellement.' He was so charmed with Augustine, as to receive for divine all his sentiments, without discrimination; and even those which all good men, among the papists themselves, regard as faults in that father. Among others, may be mentioned that dangerous doctrine, that the saints are the legitimate proprietors of the whole world, and that the wicked unjustly possess, according to the divine law, those things of which they are lawful proprietors, according to human laws. Thus, in Nicolas Fontaine's *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, i. 201, he says: 'Jésus-Christ n'est encore entré dans la possession de son Royaume temporel et des biens du monde, qui luy appartiennent, que par cette petite portion qu'en tient l'Eglise par les bénéfices de ses Clercs, qui ne sont

injurious both to church and state. They made penitence to consist principally in voluntary punishments, which a sinner should inflict on himself in proportion to his offences. For they maintained, that since man is by nature most corrupt and most wretched, he ought to retire from the world and from business, and to expiate, as it were, his inherent corruption by continual hardships and tortures of the body, by fasting, by hard labour, by prayer, and by meditation; and the more depravity any one has, either by nature or contracted by habit, the more distress and anguish of body he should impose on himself. And in this matter they were so extravagant, that they did not hesitate to call those the greatest saints, and the *sacred victims of penitence*, consumed by the fire of divine love, who intentionally pined away and died under these various kinds of sufferings and hardships; nay, they taught that this class of *suicides* were able to appease the wrath of God, and to merit much for the church and for their friends, with God, by means of their pains and sufferings. This appears from numerous examples, but especially from that of *Francis de Paris*,¹ the worker of so many miracles in the Jansenist school, who brought on himself a most cruel death, in order to appease the wrath of God.²

§ 46. A striking example of this gloomy and extravagant devotion

que les fermiers et les dépositaires de Jésus-Christ.' So then, if we believe him, a golden age is coming, in which Jesus Christ will dethrone all kings and princes, and, seizing upon the whole world, will transfer it entire to his church, of which the leaders are the priests and monks. Will the Jansenists now come forth and proclaim that they make it their greatest care to secure civil governments against the machinations of the Roman pontiffs? Respecting prayer, he philosophizes entirely in the spirit of those who are called mystics. For he denies that those who would pray, should consider beforehand what they would ask of God; because prayer does not consist in the thoughts and conceptions of the mind, but in a sort of blind impulse of divine love. Lancelot, *Mémoires touchant la Vie de l'Abbé de S. Cyran*, ii. 44, says: 'Il ne croyoit pas, que l'on dut faire quelque effort pour s'appliquer à quelque point ou à quelque pensée particulière—parce que la véritable prière est plutôt un attrait de son amour qui emporte notre cœur vers lui et nous enlève comme hors de nous-mêmes, que non pas une occupation de notre esprit qui se remplit de l'idée de quelque objet quoique divin.' He, therefore, prays best, who asks for nothing, and excludes all thoughts from his mind. Jesus Christ and his disciples knew nothing of this sublime philosophy: for he directs us to pray in a set form of words; and they, the apostles, frequently acquaint us with the subject-matter of their

prayers. But of all his errors, this undoubtedly was the worst, that he had no doubt but that he was an instrument of God, by which the Divine Being operates and works; and that he held, generally, that a pious man should follow the impulses of his mind, suspending all exercise of his judgment. And the opinion was most deeply fixed in the minds of all the Jansenists, that God himself acts and operates on the mind, and reveals to it his pleasure, when all movements of the understanding and the will are restrained and hushed. Hence, whatever thoughts, opinions, or purposes occur to them, in that state of quietude, they unhesitatingly regard as oracular manifestations and instructions from God. See *Mémoires de Port-Royal*, iii. 246, &c.

¹ [Or the Deacon Paris. Ed.]

² See John Morin's *Comment. de Penitentia*, Pref. p. 3, &c. in which there is a tacit censure of the Jansenian notions of penitence. On the other hand, see the Abbé de S. Cyran, in the *Mémoires de Port-Royal*, iii. 483. The Jansenists reckon the restoration of true penitence among the principal merits of St. Cyran; and they call him the second father of the doctrine of penitence. See *Mémoires de Port-Royal*, iii. 445, 504, &c. Yet this very penitence of his was not the least of the causes for which he was thrown into prison, by order of cardinal Richelieu. See *ibid.* i. 233, &c. 452, &c.

was exhibited in the celebrated female convent, called *Port-Royal in the Fields*,¹ situated in a deep and narrow valley not far from Paris. Henry IV., in the very commencement of this century, gave the superintendence of it to *Jacqueline* (one of the daughters of the celebrated jurist *Antony Arnauld*), who afterwards bore the name of *Maria Angelica de S. Magdalena*. She at first lived a very dissolute life, such as was common at that time in the French nunneries; but in the year 1609 the fear of God came upon her, and she entered upon habits of a very different kind; and afterwards becoming intimate, first with *Francis de Sales*, and then, in 1623, with the abbot of *St. Cyran*, she conformed both herself and her convent to their views and prescriptions. The consequence was, that this religious house, for nearly a century, excited in the Jesuits the highest disgust, and in the Jansenists the highest admiration; and its fame spread over all Europe. The consecrated virgins inhabiting it, followed with the utmost strictness the ancient, severe, and almost everywhere abrogated, rule of the Cistercians; nay, they imposed on themselves more rigours and burdens than even that rule prescribed.² A great

¹ [Port-Royal des Champs. *Tr.*—If Mosheim means by the word dissolute to throw any suspicion on the moral character of *Jacqueline Arnauld*, the imputation is simply false. He is uniformly unjust to the Jansenists, but, I think, scarcely capable of intending a false accusation. It probably means only that her life was, up to her 18th year, distinguished by no austerity, but according to the relaxed rule prevalent in the French nunneries. *Ed.*]

² There is extant a multitude of books of various kinds, in which the Jansenists describe and deplore the fortunes, the holiness, the regulations, and the destruction of this celebrated seat. We shall mention only those that are at hand, and more recent, as well as more full than the others. First, the Benedictines of *St. Maur* present a correct but dry history of the convent, *Gallia Christiana*, viii. 910, &c. A much neater, and more pleasing history, though imperfect, and somewhat chargeable with partiality, is that of the noted French poet *John Racine*, *Abbrégé de l'Histoire de Port-Royal*; which is printed among the works of his son, *Lewis Racine*, Amsterd. 1750, 6 vols. 8vo, and is in vol. ii. p. 275—366. The external state and form of this convent, are formally described by *Moleon*, *Voyages Litturgiques*, p. 234. To these add *Nicolas Fontaine's Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, Cologne (that is Utrecht), 1738, 2 vols. 8vo. *Peter Thomas du Fossé's Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, Cologne, 1739, 8vo. *Recueil de plusieurs Pièces pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, Utrecht, 1740, 8vo. The editor of these papers promises in his preface more collections of the same nature; and

he affords no slight indication, that, from these and other documents, some one may compose a perfect history of *Port-Royal*, which so many Jansenists regarded as the gate of heaven. *Claude Lancelot* has also much that relates to this subject, in his *History of the Abbot St. Cyran*. These and other works describe only the external state, and the various fortunes of this celebrated convent. The internal state, the mode of life, and numberless events that occurred among the nuns themselves, and among their neighbours, are described in the *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Port-Royal, et à la Vie de Marie Angélique d'Arnaud*, Utrecht, 1742, 5 tom. 8vo. *Vies intéressantes et édifiantes des Religieuses de Port-Royal et de plusieurs Personnes qui leur étoient attachées*. Of this work, four volumes have already been published: the first appeared, Utrecht, 1750, 8vo. They all contain various documents, of no inconsiderable value. The last fortunes and overthrow of the convent are described, especially in the *Mémoires sur la Destruction de l'Abbaye de Port-Royal des Champs*; without place, 1711, 8vo. If I do not wholly mistake, these writers add much less to the reputation and glory of this noted convent, than the Jansenists suppose. When I read their writings, *Antony Arnauld*, *Tillemont*, *Nicole*, *Isaac le Maître*, and the many others who are known by the name of the authors of *Port-Royal*, appear to me great and extraordinary men. But when I lay aside their books, and turn to those just mentioned, in which the private lives of these great men are described, they appear to me small men, fanatics, and unworthy of their high reputation. I

proportion of the *Jansenist penitents*, of both sexes and all ranks, built for themselves cottages, without the precincts of this cloister; and there led a life not unlike that which we read of in the fourth and fifth centuries, among those austere recluses called *Fathers of the desert*, who dwelt in the desert parts of Egypt and Syria. For it was the object of them all to efface the stains upon their souls, which were either innate, or acquired by habits of sinning, by means of voluntary pains and sufferings inflicted on themselves, by silence, by hunger and thirst, by praying, labouring, watching, and enduring pain.¹ Yet they did not all pursue the same species of labour. The more learned applied themselves to the writing of books; and not a few of them did great service to the cause of both sacred and profane learning. Others instructed youth in the elements of languages and the arts. But most of them, amidst rustic and servile labours, exhausted the powers of both mind and body, and wore themselves out, as it were, by a slow and lingering death. Yet many of these were illustrious personages and noblemen, who had before obtained the highest honours, both in the cabinet and in the field, and who were not ashamed now to assume the place, and perform the duties of the lowest servants. This celebrated retreat of *Jansenian penitence* experienced vicissitudes throughout this century; at one time it flourished very highly, at another it was nearly broken up. At last, as the nuns pertinaciously refused to subscribe the oath proposed by *Alexander VII.*, which has been mentioned, and as considerable injury to the commonwealth, and much disgrace to distinguished families, were supposed to arise from this convent and its regulations, *Lewis XIV.*, in the year 1709, at the instigation of the Jesuits, ordered the edifice to be pulled down and entirely demolished, and the nuns to be transferred to Paris; and two years after, that nothing might remain to nourish superstition, he ordered the bodies that were buried there to be disinterred, and removed to other places.

§ 47. The other commotions which disturbed the tranquillity of the Roman church were but light clouds compared with this tempest. The old quarrel between the Dominicans and the Franciscans, whether the mother of Jesus Christ was conceived without sin or stain (which the Dominicans denied, and the Franciscans affirmed), gave considerable trouble to *Paul V.*, *Gregory XV.*, and *Alexander VII.* Not long after the commencement of the century, it began to disturb Spain very considerably, and to produce parties. Therefore the kings of Spain, *Philip III.* and *IV.*, sent some envoys

readily give to Isaac le Maître, commonly called Sacy, the praise of a most polished genius, while reading his orations, or his other lucubrations; but when I meet him at Port-Royal, with a sickle in his hand, in company with rustics cutting down the corn, he makes a comical figure, and seems not altogether in his right mind.

¹ The first that retired to Port-Royal, in 1637, in order to purge away his sins, was

the very eloquent and highly celebrated Parisian advocate, Isaac le Maître; whose retirement brought much odium upon the abbot of St. Cyran. See *Mémoires pour l'Histoire de Port-Royal*, i. 233, &c. He was followed by many others of various classes and ranks, among whom were men of the noblest birth. See *Vies des Religieuses de Port-Royal*, i. 141, &c.

to Rome, urgently soliciting the pontiffs to decide the question by a public decree. But the pontiffs deemed it more important to follow prudence than to gratify requests from an authority so high. For they were alarmed, on the one hand, by the splendour of the Spanish throne, which inclined to the opinion of the Franciscans, and, on the other, by the credit and influence of the Dominican family. Nothing, therefore, could be obtained by repeated supplications, except that the pontiffs, by words and by ordinances, pronounced the cause of the Franciscans to be very probable, and forbade the Dominicans to assail it in public; while at the same time they would not allow the Franciscans and others to charge error upon the opinion of the Dominicans.¹ In a king or magistrate such reluctance to pass judgment would be commendable: but whether it was suitable in a man, who claims to be the divinely-constituted judge of all religious causes, and to be placed beyond all danger of erring, by the immediate power and guidance of the Holy Spirit, those may answer who support the reputation and honour of the pontiffs.

§ 48. Towards the close of this century, the mystics, whose reputation and influence were formerly so great, were exposed to very severe treatment. The first sufferer was *Michael de Molinos*, a Spanish priest, resident at Rome, in high reputation for sanctity, and therefore attended by numerous disciples of both sexes. In the year 1681 he published, at Rome, his *Way or Guide* to what the mystics call a *spiritual or contemplative life*;² that is, *Institutes of Mystic Theology*: in which he was thought to recall from the shades below the capital errors of the old *Beghards* and *Beguins*, and to open the door for all iniquity and wickedness. The substance of his system, which his friends interpret in one way, and his enemies in another, amounted to this: that all religion consists in a certain quietude of

¹ See Fred. Ulrich Calixtus, *Historia Immaculatae Conceptionis B. Virginis Mariæ*, Helmst. 1696, 4to. Add Jo. Hornbeck's *Comment. ad Bullam Urbani VIII. de Diebus Festis*, p. 250. Jo. Launoi, *Præscriptiones de Conceptu Virginis Mariæ*, Opp. t. i. pt. i. p. 9, &c. Clement XI., a long time after this, namely, in 1708, proceeded somewhat further, and by a special bull, commanded all his people to observe a festival in memory of the conception of St. Mary, the sinless. See *Mémoires de Trevoux*, for 1709, A. xxxviii. p. 514. But the Dominicans most firmly deny, that the obligations of this law extend to them; and they persevere in defending their old opinion, though with more modesty than formerly. And when we consider, that this opinion is by no means condemned by the pontiff, and that the Dominicans are not molested, though they do not celebrate that festival, it is evident, that the language of the Roman edict is to be construed in the most liberal manner, and that the decree does not contradict the earlier decrees of the pontiffs. See

Lamindus Pitranus, or Muratori, *de Ingeniorum Moderatione in Relig. Negotio*, p. 254, &c.

² This book was written in Spanish, and first published in 1675, supported by the recommendations of the greatest and most respectable men. In 1681, it was published at Rome, in Italian, though it had appeared in this language, some time before, in other places. Afterwards, it was translated into the Dutch, French, and Latin languages; and was very often printed in Holland, France, and Italy. The Latin translation, under the title of *Manuductio Spiritualis*, was published by Aug. Herm. Francke at Halle, 1687, 8vo. In Italian, it bore the title of *Guida Spirituale*. Annexed to it is another tract of Molinos, *de Communionem Quotidianam*; which was also condemned. See *Recueil de diverses Pièces concernant le Quietisme et les Quietistes, ou Molinos, ses Sentimens et ses Disciples*, Amsterd. 1688, 8vo. In this work, the first piece is Molinos' book in the French translation; and then various epistles, relating to his affairs and his sentiments.

the soul, when it is withdrawn from external and finite objects, and turned towards God, and loves Him sincerely, and without any hope of reward; or, what amounts to the same thing, if I mistake not, that the mind of a man, in pursuit of the supreme good, must be entirely withdrawn from the intercourse of the senses, and from corporeal objects; and the efforts of the understanding and the will being all hushed, the mind must be merged wholly in God, from whom it originated. Hence his followers were called *Quietists*; though the common appellation of *mystics* would have been more proper. For the doctrine of *Molinos* was accounted new, only because he expressed himself in new phraseology, which was not become trite by common use, and had arranged and digested in a better form what the ancients stated confusedly. The Jesuits, and others who watched for the interests of the Roman cause, readily perceived that he had broached a system which tacitly accused the Roman church of a departure from true religion; for that church, as is well known, makes piety to consist chiefly in ceremonies and external works. But it was the French ambassador especially, and his friends, who prosecuted the man. And from this and other circumstances, it has been plausibly inferred that political considerations, as well as religious, had their influence in this controversy: and that this Spaniard had opposed the wishes and the projects of the French king in some difficult negotiations.¹ However this may be, *Molinos* was thrown into prison in 1685; though he had a vast number of friends, and though the pontiff himself, *Innocent XI.*, was partial to him. In 1687, he publicly renounced the errors charged upon him, but notwithstanding he was delivered over to perpetual imprisonment, and he died a prisoner at an advanced age, in 1696.² Every honest and impartial man will be ready to grant that the opinions of *Molinos* were greatly distorted and misrepresented by his enemies, the Jesuits and the French, for whose interest it was that he should be put out of the way; and that he was charged with consequences from his principles, which he neither admitted, nor even thought of. On the other hand, I think it obvious

¹ [Yet, perhaps, the whole may be ascribed to the power of the Jesuits over the French court, who had father la Chaise, confessor to Lewis XIV., on their side; and he controlled Madame Maintenon, and through her the superstitious Lewis. And a king, who, two years before, had been induced to sacrifice to his own bigotry some millions of his loyal and industrious subjects, might easily be persuaded, from a lust for spiritual conquests, to persecute a single man, who was a stranger; and to oblige the pope also, to abandon for a time a man whom he loved and honoured, and to whom he had assigned a residence near his own palace; and especially, as the Inquisition were suspicious of the pontiff's own soundness in the faith. *Schl.*]

² He was born in the vicinity of Saragossa, in 1627; according to the testimony

of Domin. de Colonia, in the *Bibliothèque Janséniste*, p. 469. See, on this whole subject, the *Narrative respecting Quietism*, which is subjoined to the German translation of Gilbert Burnet's *Travels*. Godfr. Arnold's *Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*, pt. iii. ch. xvii. p. 176. Jo. Wolff. Jaeger's *Historia Eccles. et Polit. sæcul. xvii. decenn. ix.* p. 26, &c. Charles Plessis d'Argentre's *Collectio Judiciorum de novis Erroribus*, t. iii. pt. ii. p. 357, where the papal bulls are given. [The documents of the whole proceedings of the Inquisition, and of the pontiff against Molinos, are given us by Nicholas Terzagus, bishop of Narni in Italy, in his *Theologia Historico-mystica adv. vet. et novos Pseudo-mysticos, quorum Historia texitur, et Errores confutantur*, Venice, 1764, folio, p. 8, &c. *Tr.*]

that his system included most of the faults which are justly chargeable upon the mystics; and that it was well suited to the disposition of those who obtrude upon others, as divine and oracular communications, the suggestions of a heated imagination, withdrawn from the control of reason.¹

§ 49. It would have been very strange, if a man of such a character had not found disciples and followers. It is said that a considerable portion of the inhabitants of Spain, France, and the Netherlands, eagerly entered upon the way of salvation which he pointed out. Nor will this appear incredible, if it be considered, that in all provinces of the Romish world there is a large number of persons who have discernment enough to see that outward ceremonies and bodily mortifications cannot be the whole of religion, and yet have not light enough to be able to arrive at the truth by their own efforts, and without a guide. But these nascent commotions were suppressed by the church in their commencement, in some places by threatenings and punishments, and in others by blandishments and promises: and *Molinos* himself being put out of the way, his disciples and friends did not appear formidable. Among the friends and avowers of Quietistic sentiments, the following persons especially have been often mentioned; namely, *Peter Matthew Petrucci*, a pious man and one of the Roman cardinals; *Francis de la Combe*, a Barnabite, and instructor of *Madame Guyon*, who is soon to be mentioned; *Francis Malavalle*; *Berniere de Louvigni*; and some others of less note. These differed from each other, and from *Molinos*, in many particulars, as is common with mystics, who are governed more by the visions of their own minds than by fixed rules and principles. Yet if we disregard words, and look only at their import, we shall find that they all set out from the same principles, and tended to the same results.²

§ 50. In France the Quietistic doctrine was supposed to be disseminated by the writings of *Jane Maria Bouvieres de la Mothe Guyon*, a lady of distinction, of no bad intentions, and exemplary in her life, but of a fickle temper, and one whose feelings measured and controlled her religious belief; than which nothing can be more fallacious.³ As her religious opinions gave offence to many, in the year

¹ What can be said in defence of *Molinos*, has been collected by Christ. Eberh. Weismann, *Historia Eccles. sæc. xvii.* p. 555.

² The writings of these persons are enumerated, with remarks upon them, by Domin. de Colonia, in his *Bibliotheca Quietistica*, subjoined to his *Biblioth. Janseniana*, p. 455, 488. Godfr. Arnold, *Historia et Descriptio Theol. Mystica*, p. 364, and Peter Poiret, *Bibliotheca Mysticorum*, Amsterd. 1708, 8vo. [Cardinal Petrucci, born in 1636, at Ancona, cardinal 1686, died 1701; wrote *Theologia Contemplativa*; *Spiritual Letters and Tracts*; *On the Government of the Passions*; *Mystic Riddle*; *Apology for the Quietists*, &c., printed collectively, Ve-

nice, 1684.—*La Combe* was a native of Savoy, and a zealous propagator of Quietism in France. He wrote *Analysis Orationis Mentalis*; and was committed to the Bastille in 1687, where he ended his days.—*Malavalle* was born at Marseilles, 1627, became blind in infancy; yet he composed *Pratique facile pour élever l'âme à la Contemplation*; *Poésies Sacrées*, &c., and died at Marseilles, in 1719.—*De Louvigni* was king's counsellor, and treasurer at Caen, and died 1659. He wrote *Chrétien Intérieur*; and *Œuvres Spirituelles, ou Conduite assurée pour ceux qui tendent à la perfection.* Tr.]

³ This lady wrote the *History of her own Life*, which was published in French at

1687, they were submitted to the examination of several great and dignified men, and were finally pronounced erroneous and unsound; and in 1697 they were formally confuted by *Jas. Benign Bossuet*, bishop of Meaux. From this contest a greater one arose, between the two men, who at that time, as all are agreed, stood first among the French for genius and eloquence; that is, the above-named *Bossuet* and *Francis Salignac de Fenelon*, the prelate of Cambray, who was highly renowned throughout Europe. *Bossuet* asked *Fenelon* to approve and recommend his book against the errors of *Madame Guyon*. *Fenelon*, on the contrary, not only maintained that this pious lady was groundlessly taxed by her adversary with many faults, but also, in a book which he published in 1697,¹ himself adopted some of her opinions, and especially that mystical precept, that we ought to love God purely,² and without the expectation of any reward; and he confirmed the principle by the suffrages of the most eminent saints. Provoked by this dissent from him, *Bossuet*, in whose view glory was the highest good, did not cease from importuning *Louis XIV.* and *Louis XV.*, till the pontiff, in 1699, by a public decree branded as erroneous the book of *Fenelon*, but without mentioning his name; and in particular, twenty-three propositions extracted out of it. *Fenelon* was induced, either by his timidity or prudence, to approve the sentence pronounced against himself, without any exceptions, and to recommend it himself to the churches under his care.³ Many con-

Cologne (as the title-page falsely states), 1720, 12mo. Her writings, full of allegories, and of not very solid mystic phrases, have been translated into German. There is extant also, her Bible with annotations: *La Bible de Mad. Guyon, avec des Explications et Réflexions, qui regardent la Vie intérieure*, Cologne (or rather, Amsterdam), 1715, 20 vols. 8vo. From these notes especially, the genius of this lady may be learned; which was indeed fecund, but not very vigorous. See also, concerning her, *Lettres de Mad. Maintenon*, i. 249, ii. 45, 47, 49, 51, &c. [She was born in 1648, married at the age of 16, became a widow, with three children, at 28. Always charitable to the poor, and very devotional, she now devoted her whole time to religion. She spent several years with the bishop of Geneva, and then travelled with *La Combe*, in different parts of France, conversing everywhere upon religion. Returning to Paris in 1687, she propagated her religious views, not only by conversation, but by a tract on prayer, and another on the Canticles. Her persecutions soon commenced; and she was confined in monasteries and prisons much of the time till 1702, when she retired to Blois, and lived in obscurity, till her death, 1719.—The poet Cowper caused a selection of her poems to be translated and published in English: and her life, with her short and

easy method of prayer, and a poem on the Nativity, were published, Baltimore, 1812, 12mo. *Tr.*]

¹ *Explication des Maximes des Saints sur la Vie intérieure*, Paris, 1697, 12mo. It is also extant in a Latin translation.

² [Or simply for what he is. *Tr.*]

³ The history of this controversy is given at large, and with sufficient fairness, by *Toussaints du Plessis*, a Benedictine, in his *Histoire de l'Eglise de Meaux*, l. v. t. i. p. 485—523. There is more partiality in *Ramsay's Hist. de la Vie de Messire F. S. de la Mothe Fenelon*, Hague, 1723, 12mo, yet it is worth reading. See also *Voltaire*, *Siècle de Louis XIV.* ii. 301. The public acts are given by *Charles du Plessis d'Argentre*, *Collectio Judiciorum de novis Erroribus*, t. iii. pt. ii. p. 402, &c. [also in *Nic. Terzagus, Theologia Historico-mystica*, diss. iii. p. 26, &c. It is the object of this bitter polemic, to confute all the Quietists, and especially *Molinos* and *Fenelon*. *Andrew Michael Ramsay*, commonly called the *Chevalier Ramsay*, was a Scotchman, educated at Edinburgh, who went to Holland, there imbibed some notions of Quietism, went to Cambray to consult *Fenelon*, and was by him converted to the Roman catholic faith. After spending much of his life in France, he returned to Scotland in 1725, and died in 1743. He wrote much, chiefly on history,

tend that this was the magnanimous deed of a great mind, docile and disposed to prefer the peace of the church to personal honour: but others say it was the mark of either a pusillanimous or a treacherous man, who deems it lawful to profess with his lips what he disbelieves in his heart. There is, however, scarcely any one who doubts, that *Fenelon* continued to the end of life in those sentiments which, at the command of the pontiff, he had publicly rejected and condemned.

§ 51. Besides these authors of great commotions, there were others, who more slightly disturbed the public tranquillity of the Roman church by their novel and singular opinions. Of this description were the following. *Isaac la Peyrere* (*Peyreri*), who published two small works in 1655, in which he maintained that *Moses* has not recorded the origin of the human race, but only that of the Jewish nation; and that other races of men inhabited our world long before *Adam*, the father of the Jews. Although he was not a Roman Catholic when he promulgated this opinion, yet the Roman church deemed it its duty to punish an offence against religion in general; and therefore, in the year 1656, put him into prison at Brussels. And he would, perhaps, have been burnt at the stake, had he not embraced the Romish religion, and renounced that of the Reformed, in which he had been educated, and also publicly confessed his error.¹ *Thomas Albius* [*White*], or *Blacklo*, better known by the name of *Thomas Anglus*, from his native country, about the middle of the century published numerous tracts, by which he acquired much notoriety in the Netherlands, France, Portugal, and England, and not a little hatred in his own church. He undoubtedly was acute and ingenious: but relying on the principles of the Peripatetic philosophy, to which he was extravagantly devoted, he ventured to explain and elucidate by them certain articles of the Roman faith. This confidence in *Aristotle* betrayed him into opinions that were novel and strange to Roman ears; and his books were prohibited and condemned by the congregation of the *Index* at Rome, and in some other places. He is said to have died in England, and to have founded a sect among his countrymen, which time has destroyed.² *Joseph Francis Burrhi*, or

and altogether in French. His life of *Fenelon* betrays the partiality of a particular friend and admirer. *Tr.*]

¹ Peter Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, iii. 2215. [Art. *Peirere*, Isaac.] Godfr. Arnold, *Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*, vol. iii. ch. vii. p. 70. *Menagiana*, published by Bernh. Monnoye, ii. 40. [The writings of *Peyrere* were, *Præadamitæ, sive Exercitatio super versibus* 12, 13, 14, cap. v. *Epist. D. Pauli ad Rom.* 1655, 12mo, and *Systema Theolog. ex Præadamitarum Hypothesi*, pars i. His recantation was contained in *Is. Peyrerei Epistola ad Philotimum, qua exponit rationes, propter quas ejuraverit Sectam Calvinii, quam profitebatur, et librum de Præadamitis, quem ediderat.* Francf. 1658, 12mo. He afterwards lived retired at Paris, among the

Fathers of the Oratory, and was supported by the prince of Condé. *Schl.*]

² Peter Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, i. 236. [Art. *Anglus.*] Adr. Baillet, *Vie de M. des Cartes*, ii. 245. [His real name was *Thomas White*; and he was born of a respectable family of English Roman Catholics; but to disguise himself, he assumed various names, as *Albius*, *Candidus*, *Bianchi*, *Richworth*, &c. He was best known, however, by the name of *Anglus*, i.e. English. Being a man of genius, and an enthusiastic Peripatetic, but possessing little solidity of judgment, he was perpetually advancing new and singular opinions, which would not bear examination. He resided in nearly every Romish country of Europe, found reason often to change his residence, passed through various scenes,

Borrhus, a Milanese gentleman, and deeply read in chemistry and medicine; if what is reported of him be true, was not so much mistaken as insane. For the pratings attributed to him concerning the Virgin Mary, the Holy Spirit, the new celestial city, which he was to found, and the destruction of the Roman pontiff, are so absurd and ridiculous, that no one can suppose him to have been of a sane mind, without showing himself not to be so. His conduct in one place and another, shows abundantly that he had a great deal of vanity, levity, and deception, but very little of sound reason and good sense. He once escaped from the snares of the *Inquisition*, and roamed as an exile over a considerable part of Europe, pretending to be a second *Esculapius*, and an adept in the great mysteries of the chemists. But in the year 1672 he again imprudently fell into the hands of the papists, who condemned him to perpetual imprisonment.¹ A book of *Cælestine Sfondrati*, in which he attempted to explain and settle, in a new way, the controversies respecting predestination, disturbed, in 1696, a large part of the Roman church; for it did not entirely please either the Jesuits or their adversaries. Five French bishops of the highest respectability² accused him (notwithstanding he had been made a cardinal in 1646, on account of his erudition) before *Innocent XII.*, of several errors, among which was contempt for the opinions of *St. Augustine*. But this rising contest was cropped in the bud. The pontiff, indeed, promised the French that he would submit the cause to the examination of eminent theologians, and then would decide it. But, as was the Roman custom, he violated his promise, and did not venture to decide the cause.³

§ 52. As there is little to be said of the changes or enlargement of the Romish ceremonies in this century, except that *Urban VIII.* published a bull, in 1643, for diminishing the number of feast days,⁴ I shall conclude the chapter with a list of those who were canonised

and finally died in England. He was much opposed to the philosophy of Des Cartes. See Bayle, loc. cit. *Tr.*]

¹ Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, i. 609. [Art. *Borri.*] Godfr. Arnold, *Kirchen- und Ketzerhistorie*, pt. iii. ch. xviii. p. 193, and others.

² [They were Pellier, archbishop of Rheims, Noailles, archbishop of Paris, Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, Guy de Seve, bishop of Arras, and Feydeau, bishop of Amiens. *Tr.*]

³ The book was entitled *Nodus Prædestinationis dissolutus*, Rome, 1696, 4to. The letter of the French bishops, and the answer of the pontiff, are given by Charles du Plessis d'Argentre, *Collectio Judiciorum de novis Erroribus*, t. iii. pt. ii. p. 394, &c. and by Natalis Alexander, *Theologia Dogmatica et Moralis*, p. 877, &c. The letter of the bishops is remarkable, as containing censures of the Jesuits and their doctrines; and not merely of their doctrine of philoso-

phical sin, but also of their procedure in China: indeed, they say, that Sfondrati had taught worse doctrine than even the Molinists. The opinions of Sfondrati are neatly stated, and compared with those of Augustine, by Jac. Basnage, *Hist. de l'Eglise*, l. xii. c. iii. § 11, p. 713, &c.—[He taught, 1. That God sincerely and strongly desires the salvation of all men.—2. That he gives to all men gracious aid, not only sufficient, but even more than sufficient, for its attainment.—3. That God does not withhold his grace from the worst and most obstinate sinners; but sets before them incipient aid, by using which they might easily obtain the more powerful grace of God.—4. That still there remains something dark and unfathomable in the doctrine of election. *Schl.*]

⁴ This memorable bull of Urban is extant in the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, xv. 88, &c. [and in the *Magnum Bullarium Cherubini*, v. 378, dated on the Ides of September, 1642. *Tr.*]

and enrolled among the saints by the pontiffs during the century. *Clement VIII.* pronounced worthy of this highest honour, in 1601, *Raymond of Pennafort*, the noted collector of the *Decretals*; in 1608, *Francisca de Pontianis*, a Benedictine nun; and in 1610, *Charles Borromeo*, one of the most illustrious among the prelates of Milan. *Gregory XV.*, in the year 1622, gave *Theresa*, a Carmelite nun of Avila, in Spain, a place in this society. By the authority of *Urban VIII.*, in 1623, *Philip Neri*, founder of the Fathers of the Oratory in Italy, *Ignatius Loyola*, the father of the Jesuits, and *Francis Xavier*, one of Loyola's first disciples, and the apostle of the Indies, were elevated to this high rank. *Alexander VII.*, in 1658, added *Thomas de Villanueva*, a Spanish Augustinian, and in 1665, *Francis de Sales*, bishop of Geneva, to the intercessors with God. *Clement X.* joined with them, in 1670, *Peter de Alcantara*, a Franciscan, and *Maria Magdalena de Pectis*, a Florentine Carmelite nun; and the next year, 1671, *Rose*, an American nun of the third order of Dominicans, and *Lewis Bertrand*, a Spanish Dominican, who had been a missionary in America; and death alone prevented him from adding to these *Cajetan Thieneus*, a Regular Clerk of Vicenza. He was therefore enrolled among the saints, in 1691, by *Innocent XII.*, who also, in the same year, publicly decreed saintship to *John of Leon*, in Spain, an Eremit of St. Augustine, *Paschal Baylonias*, a Franciscan friar of Arragon, and *John de Deo*, a Portuguese, of the order of the Brethren of *Hospitality*; for all of whom this honour had been designed before by *Alexander VIII.*¹

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE GREEK AND ORIENTAL CHURCHES.

§ 1. State of the Greek church — § 2. Cyril Lucar. Hope of a union of the Greeks and Latins disappointed — § 3. Whether the latter corrupted the religion of the former — § 4. The Russian church. The Roskolski — § 5. Revolution in it — § 6. State of the Monophysites — § 7. The Armenians — § 8. The Nestorians.

§ 1. MANY things perhaps occurred among the Greek and other Oriental Christians which are neither uninteresting nor unimportant;

¹ The bulls of the pontiffs, by which these men and women were enrolled in the class of saints, are mentioned and retailed in their order, by Justus Fontaninus, in the *Codex Constitutionum, quas summi Pontifices ediderunt in solemnī Canonizatione Sanctorum*, p. 260, &c. Rome, 1729, fol. [And all of them, except that of Alexander VII. for the canonisation of Francis de Sales, are given at large, in the *Magnum Bullarium Cherubini*, iii. 126, 262, 287, 465; iv. 12, and

append. p. 1; vi. 76, 288, 347, and append. p. 3, 17; vii. 115, 120, 125; xi. 1; xii. 78. Tr.] As they recite the ground on which the persons were judged worthy of canonisation, these bulls afford very ample matter for the discussion of a sagacious person. Nor would it be a vain or useless labour for such a one to examine, without superstition, yet with candour, into the justice, the piety, and the truth of those grounds.

but what happens in those countries reaches us but rarely, and more rarely still undisguised by party spirit, or popular credulity. We have, therefore, not much to say here. The Greek church, in this century, as in the preceding, was in a miserable state, afflicted, uncultivated, and destitute of the means of acquiring a sound knowledge of religious subjects. This, however, is true only of the Greeks in general, or as a body. For who will have the folly to deny, that among an immense multitude of people, some of whom often visit Sicily, Venice, Rome, England, Holland, and Germany, and many carry on a successful commerce, and some are advanced to the highest employments in the Turkish court, there can be found individuals here and there who are neither poor nor unintelligent, nor wholly illiterate, nor destitute of refinement, nor, in short, overwhelmed with superstition, vice, and profligacy?¹ Their inveterate hatred of the Latins could by no contrivance or pains be dislodged from the minds of the people, nor even moderated, although the Roman pontiffs, and their numerous missionaries to the Greeks, spared neither ingenuity nor treasure to gain that nation's confidence and affections.² Latin teachers have, indeed, collected some small and poor congregations in certain islands of the Archipelago; but neither Greeks nor Turks, the masters of the Greeks, allow them the power of attempting anything more.

§ 2. In the pontificate of *Urban VIII.*, the Latins conceived great hopes that they should find the Greek and Oriental Christians more tractable in future.³ The pontiff made it one of his most assiduous

¹ This remark is made, on account of Alexander Helladius, and others who think with him. There is extant, a book of Helladius, entitled the *Present State of the Greek Church*, printed in 1714, 8vo, in which he bitterly declaims against the most meritorious and learned writers on Grecian affairs; and maintains, that his countrymen are much more pious, learned, wise, and happy, than is commonly supposed. We by no means envy the Greeks the portion of happiness they may enjoy; nay, we wish them far more than they possess. Yet we could show, if it were necessary, from the very statements which Helladius gives us, that the condition of the Greeks is no better than it is generally supposed to be; although all persons and places are not equally sunk in barbarism, superstition, and knavery. See the remarks above, on the History of the Oriental church, in the sixteenth century.

² What number of missions there are in Greece, and the other countries subject to the Turkish government, and what is their present condition, is fully stated by the Jesuit Tarillon, in his letter to Ponchartruin, *sur l'Etat présent des Missions des Pères Jésuites dans la Grèce*; which is extant in the *Nouveaux Mémoires des Missions de la Compagnie de Jésus*, i. 1125. On the state

of the Romish religion in the islands of the Archipelago, see Jac. Xavier Portier, in a letter printed in the *Lettres édifiantes et curieuses écrites des Missions étrangères*, x. 328. The high colouring of these statements may be easily corrected by the many accounts of Romish and other writers, in our own age, respecting the affairs of the Greeks. See, above all others, Richard Simon, or Sainiore's *Bibliothèque Critique*, t. i. c. xxiii. p. 340, who, in p. 346, well confirms, among other things, that which we have observed from Urban Cerri; namely, that none oppose and resist the Latins, with more vehemence, than the Greeks who have been educated at Rome, or trained in other schools of the Latins. He says: 'Ils sont les premiers à crier contre et à médire du Pape et des Latins. Ces pèlerins Orientaux, qui viennent chez nous, fourbent et abusent de notre crédulité pour acheter un bénéfice et tourmenter les Missionnaires Latins,' &c. The most recent and most full testimony to the invincible hatred of the Greeks against the Latins, is given by John Cowell, *Account of the Present Greek Church*, preface, p. 9, &c. Cambridge, 1722, folio.

³ See Jo. Morin's *Life*, prefixed to his *Antiquitates Ecclesiæ Orientalis*, p. 37—46.

cares to effect the difficult design of subjecting the Oriental Christians, and especially the Greeks, to the dominion of the Roman see; and he called in the aid of men, who were best acquainted with the opinions of the Greeks and the eastern Christians, to point out to him the plainest and shortest method of accomplishing the object. The wisest of these were of opinion, that those Christians should be allowed to retain nearly all their long-established peculiarities both of rites and usages, and of doctrine; which the Latin doctors had formerly deemed insufferable: for rites and usages, they said, do not pertain to the essence of religion; and their doctrines should be explained and understood, so as to appear to differ as little as possible from the opinions and institutions of the Latins; because those Christians would feel less repugnance to union, if they could be persuaded that they had long been Romanists, and that the pontiffs did not require them to abandon the principles of their fathers, but only to understand them correctly. Hence arose those erudite works, composed however with little ingenuousness, published by *Leo Allatius*, *John Morin*, *Clement Galanus*, *Lucas Holstenius*, *Abraham Echellensis*,¹ and others, in which they undertook to prove that there was little or no difference between the religion of the Greeks, Armenians, and Nestorians, and that of the Romans, provided we set aside a few rites and certain unusual words and phrases adopted by those foreign Christians. This project of uniting the Greeks with the Latins was by no one more firmly resisted than by *Cyril Lucar*, patriarch of Constantinople, a learned man, who had travelled over a great part of Europe. For he signified clearly, indeed more clearly than was prudent, that his mind was inclined towards the religious opinions of the English and the Dutch, and that he contemplated a reformation of the ancient religion of the Greeks. The Jesuits, aided by the influence of the French ambassador, and by the knavery of certain perfidious Greeks, vigorously opposed this powerful adversary for a long time, and in various ways, and at length vanquished him. For they caused him to be accused before the Turkish emperor of the crimes

¹ The work of Leo Allatius, *de Concordia Ecclesiæ Orientalis et Occidentalis*, is well known; and the most learned men, among both the Lutherans and the reformed, with the greatest justice, charge it with bad faith. He also published his *Græcia Orthodoxa*, Rome, 1652 and 1659, 4to, which contains the tracts of the Greeks that favoured the Latins. From the pen of Lucas Holstenius, who was far superior to Allatius in learning and ingenuousness, we have only two dissertations, *de Ministro et Forma Sacramenti Confirmationis apud Græcos*; which were published after his death, Rome, 1666, 8vo. The very learned works of John Morin, *de Penitentia*, and *de Ordinationibus*, are well known by the learned; and every one that peruses them can see, that the author aims to evince that there is a wonderful agree-

ment on these subjects, between the Christians of the east and the Latins, provided the thorny subtleties of the scholastics are kept out of sight. Clemens Galanus, in a prolix and elaborate work, published at Rome, 1650 [1690, 2 vols.], folio, laboured to prove, that the Armenians differ but little from the Latins. Abraham Echellensis, both elsewhere, and in his notes to Hebed Jesu, *Catalogus Librorum Chaldaicorum*, maintains that all the Christians throughout Asia and Africa, coincide with the Latin church. Other writers on this subject are passed over. [Among these were Fred. Spanheim's *Diss. de Ecclesiæ Græcæ et Orientalis a Romana Papali perpetua dissensione*, in his *Opp.* ii. 485, &c. and Ja. Elsner's *Latest Account of the Greek Christians in Turkey*, ch. v. (in German). *Schl.*]

of treason and rebellion: on which charge he was strangled in the year 1638.¹ He was succeeded by the Greek who had been the

¹ There is extant a confession of faith, drawn up by Cyril Lucar, and repeatedly published, particularly in Holland, 1646, 8vo, from which it clearly appears, that he favoured the Reformed religion more than that of his countrymen. It was published among Jac. Aymon's *Monumens authentiques de la Religion des Grecs*, p. 237. Yet he was not averse from the Lutherans: for he addressed letters about this time to the Swedes, whose friendship he endeavoured to conciliate. See Arkenholtz's *Mémoires de la Reine Christine*, i. 486, and ii. append. Documents, 113, &c. The same Aymon has published twenty-seven letters of this prelate, addressed to the Genevans, and to others professing the reformed religion; *ubi supra*, p. 1—199, which more fully exhibit his disposition and his religious opinions. The life and the unhappy death of this, in various respects, extraordinary man, are described by Thomas Smith, an Englishman, in his *Narratio de Vita, Studiis, Gestis et Martyrio Cyrilli Lucaris*, which is inserted in his *Miscellanea*, Lond. 1686, 8vo, p. 49—130, also by Jo. Henry Hottinger, *Analecta Historico-theol.* append. Diss. viii. p. 550, and by others, whom Jo. Alb. Fabricius has enumerated, *Bibliotheca Græca*, vol. x. p. 499. [Cyril Lucar was born in 1572, in Candia, then subject to the Venetians. Possessing fine native talents, he first studied at Venice and Padua, and then travelled over Italy and other countries. Disgusted with the Romish religion, and charmed with that of the reformed, he resided awhile at Geneva. On his return to Greece, he connected himself with his countryman Meletius Piga, bishop of Alexandria, who resided much at Constantinople, and was often legate to the patriarch. Cyril became his chaplain, and then Archimandrite. The efforts of the Romanists, in 1595, to gain the Russian and Polish Greek churches, were resisted at Constantinople, and Cyril was active in opposing the defection. His efforts in this cause exposed him to the resentments of the Polish government; and in 1600 he had to quit that country. He went to Alexandria, was there highly respected, and on the death of Meletius, in 1602, he succeeded him in that see. He now kept up a correspondence with several reformed divines; and among them with George Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury. It was at this time that he sent to England the celebrated Alexandrine codex of the Bible, containing St. Clement's epistle to the Corinthians. His aversion to the Roman church drew on him the hatred and persecution of the Jesuits, and of all in the East

who favoured the Roman cause. In 1612, he was at Constantinople, and the Romish interest alone prevented his election to the patriarchal chair. He retired to Alexandria; but in 1621 he was elected to the see of Constantinople, in spite of the Romish opposition. But his persecutors never ceased to traduce him, and to plot against him. He was, besides, too far in advance of the Greeks to be popular with the multitude; and the Turkish government would at any time depose a patriarch, and admit a new one, for a few thousand dollars. In 1622 he was banished to Rhodes, and Gregory of Amasea purchased the office for 20,000 dollars; but not having the money on hand, he also was sent away, and Anthimus, bishop of Adrianople, having money, purchased the office. But the Greeks would not submit to him, and he was obliged to resign to Cyril, who was restored, on paying a large sum for the privilege. The Romanists still plotted against him. He sent a Greek to London to learn the art of printing, and to procure a printing press. On its arrival, his enemies charged him with employing it for political purposes, and caused him great trouble, though the English and Dutch ambassadors interposed in his behalf. In 1629, having a little respite, he called a council of Greeks, to reform that church; and here he proposed his confession of faith, which was adopted. In 1633, Cyril Contari, bishop of Berrheea, the personal enemy of Cyril Lucar, and supported by the Romish party, bargained with the Turks for the patriarchal chair; but being unable to pay the money down, he was exiled to Tenedos, and Lucar retained the office. The next year Athanasius of Thessalonica paid the Turks 60,000 dollars for the office, and Lucar was again banished; but at the end of a month he was recalled and reinstated, on his paying 10,000 dollars. But now Cyril Contari had raised his 50,000 dollars, and Cyril Lucar was banished to Rhodes to make way for him. After six months, his friends purchased his restoration. But in 1638, he was falsely accused of treason, in the absence of the emperor, who, upon the representation of his vizier, gave orders for his death. He was seized, conveyed on board a ship as if for banishment; and as soon as the vessel was at sea, he was strangled, and thrown overboard. His body drifted ashore, and was buried by his friends. See Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch. seit der Reform.* v. 394, &c., and *Unpartheiische Kirchenhistorie*, Jena, 1735, ii. 255, &c. *Tr.*—Neale's *Patr. Alexandr.* ii. 356, &c. *Ed.*]

principal assistant to the Jesuits in the destruction of this great man, namely, *Cyrl* of Berrhœa, a man of a malignant and violent temper; and as he apostatised to the Romish religion, the union of the Greeks and Latins now seemed no longer dubious.¹ But the unhappy fate of the man suddenly dissipated this hope. For this great friend of the Roman pontiff, in little more than a year, was put to death in the same manner as his enemy before had been; and *Parthenius*, who had the hereditary hostility of his nation to the Latins, was placed at the head of the Greek church. From this time onward, no good opportunity has been found by the Romans for assailing the Greek patriarchs, or for drawing them over to their interests.

§ 3. Yet very many complain, and none more than the Reformed, that the flatteries, the sophistry, and the gold, both of the French ambassadors in Turkey and of the Jesuits, have had so much effect of late upon the ignorance and the poverty of the Greek bishops, that they have departed from the religion of their fathers in several respects, and especially on the doctrine of the Eucharist; and have adopted, among other errors of the Latins, the inexplicable doctrine of transubstantiation. And this, they say, was especially done in the celebrated council of Jerusalem which *Dositheus* assembled in the year 1672.² This charge, whether it be true or false, was first advanced upon occasion of a dispute between the papists and the Reformed in France. The latter, at the head of whom was the very eloquent and erudite *John Claude*, maintained that many opinions of the Romanists, and especially that which asserts that the bread and the wine in the Eucharist are so changed into the body and blood of Christ, as still to leave the external appearance of bread and wine, were wholly unknown in ancient times, and were not found among the Latins themselves before the ninth century: the former, on the contrary, *Antony Arnaud*, and his associates in managing the cause, contended that the Roman belief respecting the Lord's Supper, had been the received opinion among Christians in every age; and that it was approved by all the sects of Christians in the East, in particular by the Greeks.³ This controversy required authorities and testimonies. Hence the French envoys at Constantinople, with the Jesuits on the one part,

¹ See Elias Veiel's *Defensio Exercitationis de Ecclesia Græca*, p. 100, &c. in which, p. 103, is a letter of Urban VIII. to this *Cyrl* of Berrhœa, highly commending him for having successfully averted from the Greeks the pernicious errors of Lucar, and exhorting him to depose the bishops that were opposed to the Latins, with the promise of aid both from Rome and from the Spanish government. This *Cyrl* died a member of the Roman church. Henry Hilarius, *Notes to Phil. Cuprii Chronicon Ecclesiæ Græcæ*, p. 470.

² The proceedings of this council were published, after an edition by a French Benedictine, by Jac. Aymon, *Monumens Authentiques de la Religion des Grecs*, i. 263.

See Gisbert Cuper's *Epistolæ*, p. 404, 407. Notes illustrative of it may be seen, besides other places, in Jac. Basnage's *Hist. de la Religion des Eglises Réformées*, period iv. pt. i. c. xxxii. &c. p. 452, and in Jo. Cowell's *Account of the Present Greek Church*, book i. ch. v. p. 136, &c. [See also Thom. Ittig's *Heptad.* Dissertat. No. v. de *Synodo Hierosol.* Schl.—The Acts of this council, Gr. and Lat., are in Harduin's *Concilia*, xii. 179, &c. Tr.]

³ The names and works of the principal writers on this controversy, may be learned from Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Græca*, x. 444, &c., and Christopher Matth. Pfaff, *Dissertatio contra Ludov. Rogeri Opus Eucharisticum*, Tübing. 1718, 4to.

and the Dutch and English ministers on the other, laboured indefatigably to collect opinions of the Greeks in favour of their respective sides. It so happened that the Romanists got the advantage in their testimonies, both as to number and weight. The Reformed, however, contended, that in the whole of them there was really no weight at all, since they were either squeezed by money out of the starving Greeks, or came from people who were ignorant and knew nothing of such matters, or who were deceived by insidious language.¹ Whoever shall bring to the decision of this controversy a good acquaintance with Grecian affairs, and a mind unbiassed by prejudice, will judge, I apprehend, that no small part of the Greek church had for many ages possessed some obscure idea of *transubstantiation*, but received more clear and explicit views of it, in modern times, from the Romans.²

§ 4. Of the independent Greek churches, or those not subject to the Byzantine patriarch, the Russian is the only one that affords any matter for history; the others lie buried in prodigious ignorance and darkness. Among the Russians about the year 1666, a certain sect showed itself, and produced no little commotion, which called itself *Isbraniki*, or the *company of the elect*, but by its adversaries it was called *Roskolskika*, that is, the *seditionous faction*.³ What it finds to censure in the modern Greek church, and what opinions and rites it holds, is not yet fully known. Its adherents, however, appear in general to distinguish themselves by a great show of piety, and to represent the ancient religion of the Russians as much marred, partly by the negligence and partly by the licentiousness of the bishops.⁴

¹ Here should be consulted above all others, John Cowell, who was resident at Constantinople when this drama was acted, and himself saw by what artifices the Greeks were induced to give testimony in favour of the Latins: *Account of the Present Greek Church*, pref. p. ii. &c. and book i. ch. v. p. 136, &c.

² Maturin Veiss la Croze, who is well known to have been by no means partial to the Jesuits and to Romish opinions, supposes that the Greeks had long been infected with the doctrine of transubstantiation. See Gisb. Cuper's *Epistolæ*, edited by Beyer, p. 37, 44, 48, 51, 65.

³ Perhaps these are the very persons whom the celebrated Gmelin, in his *Travels in Siberia*, in German, iv. 404, calls *Sterowzerzi*. [They doubtless come under this denomination; for Rob. Pinkerton (*Present State of the Greek Church in Russia*, Appendix, p. 227) tells us, 'The national church in Russia gives the general name of Raskolniks, or Schismatics, to all the sects which have at different periods renounced her communion; but these separatists uniformly style themselves Staroversti, or Believers of the old faith.' Tr.]

⁴ See Nic. Bergius, *de Statu Ecclesiæ et*

Religionis Moscoviticæ, sect. xi. cap. vii. p. 69. Add sect. ii. cap. xvi. p. 218, and in the Append. p. 270. Jo. Mich. Heineccius on the Greek Church (written in German), pt. iii. p. 30, &c. Peter van Haven's *Travels in Russia*, p. 316 of the German translation. Some Lutheran writers have supposed or suspected, that these Isbraniki were a progeny of the ancient Bogomils. [Mosheim's account of the Russian dissenters is very lame. See the whole Appendix to Rob. Pinkerton's *Present State of the Greek Church in Russia*, ed. New York, 1815, p. 227—276. He tells us, it is common to date the origin of sectarians in the Russian church, about the middle of the seventeenth century, in the time of the patriarch Nikon. But according to the Russian annals, there existed schismatics in the Russian church 200 years before the days of Nikon; and the disturbances which took place in his time, only proved the means of augmenting their numbers, and of bringing them forward into public view. The earliest of these schismatics first appeared in Novogorod, early in the fifteenth century, under the name of Strigolniks. A Jew named Horie preached a mixture of Judaism and Christianity, and proselyted two priests, Denis

The Russians long assailed this factious throng with councils, confutations, very harsh punishments, military force, and flatteries; but the effect of all these remedies was to drive them to more remote regions, and, as is usual, to render them more pertinacious in consequence of their calamities and sufferings. A milder treatment began to be shown them from the time that *Peter I.*, whose achievements procured him the surname of *Great*, introduced a great change in both the civil and ecclesiastical government of the Russian empire. But the schism is so far from being healed, that this revolution in the Russian affairs is said rather to have added firmness and stability to it.

§ 5. It will not be improper here to subjoin a few remarks respecting that reformation of the Russian church, by *Peter I.*, which we have just mentioned; for though it belongs to the following century, yet the foundations for it were laid in the close of this. That immortal prince suffered the Greek religion, as professed by the Russians, to remain entire: but he took very great pains to have it explained according to sound reason and the Holy Scriptures; to destroy that superstition which was diffused greatly over the whole nation; and to dispel the amazing ignorance both of the priests and the common people. These were great and noble designs, but exceedingly difficult, and such as often require ages for their accomplishment. To effect them the more readily, Peter became the patron of all the arts and sciences, invited learned men from every quarter into the country, established new schools, and purged the old ones of their barbarism, laboured to enkindle in his subjects a thirst for learning of all kinds and for literature, abolished the iniquitous

and Alexie, who gained a vast number of followers. This sect was so numerous that a national council was called, towards the close of the fifteenth century, to oppose it. Soon afterwards, one Karp, an excommunicated deacon, joined the Strigolniks, and accused the higher clergy of selling the office of the priesthood, and of so far corrupting the church, that the Holy Ghost was withdrawn from it. He was a very successful propagator of this sect. But numerous as the Strigolniks were, they were few compared with the vast number and variety of sectarians, produced by the attempts to correct the copies of the Russian liturgy, or books used in the churches, which amount to twenty folio volumes. These having long been preserved by transcription, were found to contain numerous mistakes of transcribers, and to differ greatly from each other. The higher clergy and the princes, as early as 1518, attempted to correct these books, and bring them all to an agreement. And the object was pursued for more than a century, amidst great opposition, before it was fully accomplished. The great body of the Ras-kolniks, or dissenters, though divided into

various sects, yet all agree with one another, and with the national church, in articles of faith, and generally in rites and modes of worship; but they consider the national church as corrupt, as having falsified the sacred books, and thus subverted religion. There are, however, some minor sects, which differ from the establishment both in faith and worship. Pinkerton divides them into two grand classes, the Popopftschins, or those who admit the national priests that apostatise to them, to officiate still as priests, without reordination; and the Bezpopofschins, or those who either have no priests, or have only such as they themselves ordain. Of the former class he enumerates five sects, and the latter fifteen. But the history of these sects more properly belongs to the following century. See also Stäudlin's *Kirchliche Geographie*, i. 289, &c. Tr. —For the history of the Russian church at this time, which is extremely interesting, see Stanley's *Eastern Church*, lectures ix—xii.; Palmer's *Dissertations on the Orthodox Communion*, diss. iii.—v.; and Mouravieff's *History of the Russian Church*. Ed.]

practice of persecuting and punishing those who were in error, and finally granted to all Christian sects dissenting from the Greeks entire liberty to worship according to their own views. Yet in the last particular he was careful to restrain the eagerness of the Romanists for extending the dominion of their pontiff. They had certain places assigned them, in which, if they chose to reside among the Russians, they might worship in their own way. But the Jesuits were prohibited from teaching among the Russians; and the council that controls all matters of religion, was directed to see that Romish opinions were not propagated among the people. All ecclesiastical affairs are managed quite otherwise than formerly. For the emperor suppressed the splendid office of patriarch, because it seemed incompatible with his own dignity, and made himself supreme pontiff and head of the Russian church.¹ The patriarchal functions are vested in a council established at St. Petersburg, called the *Holy Synod*, over which some *archbishop* of distinguished prudence and fidelity presides.² The first that filled this office was the celebrated *Stephen Javorski*, well known by his work in the Russian language against heretics.³ The other ecclesiastical offices remain as before; but they are deprived of much of the authority formerly annexed to them, and of no small part of their revenues and privileges. At first it was intended to suppress all monasteries, whether for men or for women. But from this design the emperor so far departed afterwards, that he himself dedicated a magnificent house of this kind to *Alexander Newsky*, whom the Russians number among their saints.⁴

§ 6. A part of the *Asiatic Monophysites*, for a time, left the religion of their fathers, and united themselves with the Romanists. Their prompter to this measure was one *Andrew Achigian*, who had been educated at Rome, was appointed *patriarch* by the Roman pontiff, and assumed the name of *Ignatius XIV*.⁵ At his death,

¹ [Maclaine very justly criticises the language here used by Mosheim, which implies that the emperor assumed a *spiritual office* and *spiritual power*. He only claimed the right as *emperor*, to receive appeals from the ecclesiastical courts, and to give law to priests as well as to the rest of his subjects. He was head of the church, in much the same sense as the kings of England and the German princes are; none of whom ever presumed to administer the sacraments, or to perform any appropriate functions of a clergyman or priest. *Tr.*]

² [This is not perfectly correct. In 1700, Peter abolished the patriarchal office, and appointed an *Exarch*, with limited powers, who could do nothing without the consent of the other bishops, and was obliged to refer all affairs of moment to the decision of the Tzar himself. Such was Stephen Javorski, mentioned in the next sentence. But in 1720 Peter abolished the Exarchy also, and in place of it instituted the *Holy Legislative Synod*, consisting first of twelve,

and afterwards of an indefinite number of the higher clergy, selected by the emperor. At the head of this synod there is always a layman, who is the representative of the Tzar, and has a negative upon all its resolutions, till they are laid before the emperor. This nobleman is the minister of the crown for the department of religion. See Pinkerton, *l. c.* p. 26, &c., and Stäudlin's *Kirchliche Geographie*, i. 269, &c. *Tr.*]

³ See Mich. le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, i. 1295.

⁴ On these subjects much information may be obtained from Peter van Haven's *Travels in Russia*; which are extant in a German translation from the Danish.

⁵ From the fifteenth century onward, all the primates of the Monophysite sect have chosen to bear the name of Ignatius; for no other reason, if I do not mistake, than to indicate by their name, that they are successors to Ignatius, the bishop of Antioch in the first century, and the legitimate *patriarchs* of that see. A similar motive has

one *Peter*, who took the name of *Ignatius XXV.*, assumed the office; but at the instigation of the legitimate primate of the sect, he was banished by the Turks, and the little flock of which he was the head was soon dispersed.¹ Of the *African Monophysites*, the *Copts*, notwithstanding their wretchedness, ignorance, and poverty, firmly resisted the persons who so often solicited them, with very advantageous offers, to become united with the Romans. In what manner the *Abyssinians* freed themselves from the yoke of the Roman bishop, which they had indiscreetly taken upon themselves, and asserted their ancient independence, has already been stated. And it will now be proper to add, that in some of the Lutherans a holy desire arose to deliver the Abyssinian nation from the darkness of ignorance and superstition, and to bring them to a better knowledge of religion. Prompted by such motives, *Peter Heyling* of Lubeck, a very pious and learned man, visited them in the year 1634; who, after spending many years in Ethiopia, where he gained so much upon the emperor, as to be made his prime minister, and having accomplished much for the advantage of the people, on his return to Europe, lost his life by means unknown.² Afterwards, *Ernest*, duke of Saxe-Gotha, whose exemplary virtue procured him the surname of *Pious*, at the suggestion and recommendation of that extraordinary man, *Job Ludolf*, attempted to explore a way for teachers of the reformed religion to go among those distant Christians, by means of *Gregory*, an Abyssinian, who was then in Europe.³ But *Gregory* perishing by shipwreck in 1657, *Ernest* sent *Jo. Mich. Wansleben*, of Erfurth, in 1663, with very wise instructions, to conciliate, if possible, the good-will of the Abyssinians towards the Germans. *Wansleben*, however, lingered in

induced the Maronite primates, who also claim the title of patriarchs of Antioch, to assume the name of Peter. For St. Peter is said to have governed the church of Antioch before Ignatius.

¹ See Jo. Simon Asseman's *Biblioth. Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana*, ii. 482, and in *Diss. de Monophysitis*, § iii. p. 6, 7.

² A valuable life of this man was published in German, by Jo. Henry Michaelis, Halle, 1724, 8vo. Add Jo. Möller's *Cimbria Litterata*, i. 253, &c. [His father was a jeweller of Lubeck. After a good education in his native city, he went to Paris in 1627, having charge of four noble youths. There he became intimate with Hugo Grotius. From Paris he went to Italy, and thence to Malta, where he disputed with the catholic priests. He now assumed the garb of a pilgrim, intending to travel into the East, and acquaint himself with oriental literature. He proceeded to Constantinople, and thence to Palestine and Egypt. He arrived in Egypt in 1634, and so recommended himself to the Copts, by his learning and his piety, that they esteemed him highly, and gave him the title of Moollah. Meeting with the new primate of Ethiopia, who had

come to Alexandria for ordination, he joined him; and on their way to Abyssinia, they met Mendez, the Portuguese Jesuit, just banished from that country, whom Heyling encountered and confuted, in a public dispute. Mendez wrote to the pope, that if this Lutheran should go into Abyssinia, he would involve that whole nation in extreme heresy. He arrived there in 1634, and was very popular and useful; but how long he lived, and where he died, is very uncertain. A letter of his to H. Grotius, dated at Memphis, Aug. 28, 1634, respecting the disputes between the Melchites and the Jacobites, is extant in Ludolf's *Comment. ad Hist. Æthiop.* l. iii. c. viii. See Möller, *loc. cit. Tr.*]

³ See Job Ludolf's Preface to his *Comment. ad Hist. Æthiopicam*, p. 31, &c. Christ. Juncker's *Vita Jobi Ludolfi*, p. 68, &c. [Ludolf became acquainted with this Gregory during his tour to Rome, and invited him into Germany. He resided awhile at the court of Gotha, but afterwards was desirous of returning to his country; and on his way, at Alexandretta in Syria, lost his life by shipwreck. *Schl.*]

Egypt; and upon his return, not being able to account for the money that he had received, he went over to the Romish religion in 1667, and became a Dominican friar.¹ Thus the designs of this excellent duke were frustrated: yet they were attended with this advantage, that *Job Ludolf*, by his very learned and elaborate works, threw much light upon the history, the sentiments, and the literature of the Abyssinians, which before had been but little known among the Europeans.

§ 7. A considerable change in the affairs of the Armenians took place not long after the commencement of this century, originating from *Abbas I.*, the king of Persia, who for his achievements was surnamed the *Great*; for he laid waste all that part of Armenia which was contiguous to Persia, with a view to prevent the Turks from invading his territories; and caused most of its inhabitants to migrate and settle in Persia. For what the Europeans endeavour to accomplish by erecting castles and fortresses along their borders, the kings of the East prefer to effect by depopulating the frontier parts and provinces of their kingdoms. The richest and best of these Armenians removed to *Ispahan*, the capital of the kingdom, and took up their abode in the splendid suburb which the king called *Julfa*, where they have their own bishop. So long as *Abbas* lived, as he was a magnanimous prince and much attached to his people, these exiles enjoyed great prosperity; but after his death, they were involved in calamities and persecutions.² And hence, not a few of them have apostatised to Mahomedism; and it is to be feared that this portion of the Armenian church will become wholly extinct. On the other hand, the Asiatic Armenians have, undoubtedly, derived no little advantage from the permanent settlement of very many of their nation, during this century, for commercial purposes, in most of the countries of Europe, as at Marseilles in France, and in London, Amsterdam, and Venice.³ For, not to mention other things, this has afforded them

¹ Concerning this unstable and vicious, but learned man, much may be collected from Jerome Lobo's *Voyage de l'Abyssinie*, i. 198, 227, 233, 248. Ern. Solom. Cyprian's *Catalogus MSS. Bibliothecæ Gothanæ*, p. 64. Euseb. Renaudot, *Præf. ad Historiam Patriarchar. Alexandrinorum*. Jac. Echard and Quetif, *Scriptores Ordinis Prædicator. ii.* 693. We have his *Historia Ecclesiæ Alexandrinæ*, and other works, which are not without merit. [The patriarch of Alexandria persuaded him not to prosecute his journey into Abyssinia. After changing his religion at Rome, he went to Paris, whence Colbert, in 1672, sent him again to Egypt, to procure a fuller account of the state of that country, and to purchase rare manuscripts for the king's library. But Colbert seemed dissatisfied with his proceedings; for Wansleben was not in the least respected at Paris; and, from vexation, he assumed, in 1678, the vicarage of a village not far from Fon-

tainebleau; and died in 1679, in the curacy of Bouron, where he was also vicar. Before his journey to Egypt, at Ludolf's request, he went to London, to superintend there the printing of the first edition of his *Ethiopic Grammar and Lexicon*, in 1661: and there he aided Edm. Castell in the preparation of his *Lexicon Heptaglosson*. After his return from the East, he wrote his *Relazione dello Stato presente dell'Egitto*; and in 1677, his *Nouvelle Relation, en forme de Journal, de son Voyage fait en Egypte*. His history of the church of Alexandria was also published in French. *Schl.*]

² See Jo. Chardin, *Voyage en Perse*, ii. 106, &c. Gabr. du Chignon, *Nouvelles Relations du Levant*, p. 206, &c. [The Armenians have still two archbishops and three bishops in Persia; see J. M. Neale, *Holy Eastern Church*, Intr. i. 107. *Ed.*]

³ Of the Armenians residing at Marseilles, and the books they have printed there, see

an opportunity to print the Bible, and many other books, especially those of a religious kind, in the Armenian character, in Holland chiefly and England; which books, being sent to the Armenians living under the Persians and Turks, undoubtedly keep that race, which is rude and inclined to superstition, from losing all knowledge of the Christian religion.

§ 8. The disunion among the Nestorians, which rent that church in the preceding century, could not be healed at all in this. Among the patriarchs of Mosul, *Elias II.* sent his envoy to Rome, in the year 1607, and again in the year 1610, to obtain the friendship of the pontiff; and in a letter to *Paul V.*, he avowed himself ready to sanction a union between the Nestorians and the Romans.¹ *Elias III.*, though at first extremely averse from the Romish rites, yet, in the year 1657, addressed a letter to the Congregation *de propaganda fide*, signifying his willingness to join the Roman church, provided the pontiffs would grant to the Nestorians a place of worship at Rome, and would not corrupt or disturb at all the tenets of the sect.² But the Romans doubtless perceived that a union formed on the terms here stated, would be of no use or advantage to their cause; for we have no information, that the Nestorians were at that time received into the Romish communion, or that the prelates of Mosul afterwards were again solicitous to conciliate the Roman pontiff. The Nestorian patriarchs of Ormia, who all bore the name of Simeon, likewise made two proposals, in 1619 and 1653, for renewing their former alliance with the Roman pontiffs, and sent to Rome a tract explanatory of their religious sentiments. But either these prelates did not offer satisfactory terms to the Romans,³ or, on account of their poverty and very slender power, they were despised at Rome: for it appears, that from the year 1617, the prelates at Ormia were in a very low state, and no longer excited the envy of those at Mosul.⁴ There was, however, a little poor congregation of Roman Catholics formed among the Nestorians about the middle of this century, whose bishops or patriarchs reside in the city of Amida or Diarbekir, and all bear the name of Joseph.⁵ The Nestorians inhabiting the coast of Malabar, and who are called Christians of St. Thomas, so long as the Portuguese possessed those regions, were miserably harassed by the Romish priests, especially by the Jesuits; and yet no vexations, nor menaces, nor artifices, could bring the whole of them to prefer Roman sacred rites to those of their fathers.⁶ But when Cochin was conquered by the

Rich. Simon's *Lettres Choisies*, ii. 137. Of their Bible, printed in Holland, he likewise treats, *ibid.* iv. 160. So also does Jo. Joach. Schroeder, in his *Thesaurus Lingue Armenicæ*; or rather in the *Diss. de Lingua Armenica*, which is prefixed to this *Thesaurus*, c. iv. p. 60. The other Armenian books printed at Venice, Lemberg, and especially at Amsterdam, are enumerated by this very learned man, *loc. cit.* c. ii. § xxv. &c. p. 38, &c.

¹ Jos. Sim. Asseman, *Biblioth. Orient. Clement. Vaticana*, i. 543, ii. 457, iii. pt. i. p. 650.

² Asseman, *l. c.* iii. pt. ii. p. cml.

³ Asseman, *l. c.* i. 531, ii. 457, iii. pt. i. p. 622.

⁴ Peter Strozza, *Præfatio ad Librum de Chaldeorum Dogmatibus*.

⁵ See Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, ii. 1078.

⁶ Of these, Matur. Veiss la Croze treats

Dutch, in 1663, and the Portuguese were expelled from those regions,¹ their former liberty of worshipping God in the manner of their ancestors was restored to that oppressed people; and they continue to enjoy it to the present time. At the same time, the Dutch give no trouble to those among them who choose to continue in the Romish religion, provided they will treat kindly and peacefully those who differ from them.

largely, *Histoire du Christianisme des Indes*,
l. v. p. 344, &c.

¹ Gautier Schouten, *Voyage aux Indes
Orientales*, i. 319, &c. p. 466, &c.

PART II.

THE HISTORY OF THE MODERN CHURCHES.

CHAPTER I.

HISTORY OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

§ 1. Adverse events in the Lutheran church. Hesse becomes Reformed — § 2. Brandenburg Reformed — § 3. Attempted union between the Lutherans and Reformed — § 4. Decree of Charenton. Conference at Leipsic — § 5. Conferences at Thorn and Cassel — § 6. Pacific acts of John Duraeus — § 7. John Matthiæ and George Calixtus — § 8. External advantages of the Lutherans — § 9. Literature everywhere cultivated — § 10. State of Philosophy. Aristotelians everywhere reign — § 11. Liberty in philosophizing gradually increases — § 12. Excellences and defects of the teachers — § 13. The faults of the times, often, rather than of the persons — § 14. Ecclesiastical government: divine right — § 15. The more distinguished Lutheran writers — § 16, 17. History of the Lutheran religion — § 18. Dogmatic Theology — § 19, 20. Commotions in the Lutheran church — § 21. Commencement of the Calixtine controversies — § 22. Continuation and issue — § 23. The doctrines of Calixtus — § 24. Contests with the divines of Rinteln and Königsberg — § 25. With those of Jena — § 26. Origin of the Pietists — § 27. Commotions at Leipsic — § 28. Their progress — § 29. Rise of the controversies with Spener and the divines of Halle — § 30, 31. Their increase — § 32. Some sought to advance piety at the expense of truth: Godfrey Arnold — § 33. John Conrad Dippel — § 34. Fictions of Jo. Will. Petersen — § 35. Jo. Casp. Schade, and Jo. Geo. Boesius — § 36. Contests on the omnipresence of Christ's body, between the divines of Tübingen and Giessen — § 37. Herman Rathmann — § 38. Private controversies — § 39. Those of Prætorius and Arndt — § 40. Jac. Boehmen — § 41. Prophets of this age — § 42. Ezek. Meth, Esaias Stiefel, and Paul Nagel — § 43. Christ. Hoburg, Fred. Breckling, and Seidenbecher — § 44. Martin Seidelius.

§ 1. THE evils and calamities which the Roman pontiffs, or the Austrians (often too obsequious to the pleasure of the pontiffs in things pertaining to religion), either brought or endeavoured to bring upon the Lutherans, in various ways, during this century, have been already mentioned, in the history of the Roman church. We shall therefore now mention only certain other things, by which the Lutheran church lost something of its splendour and amplitude. *Maurice*, landgrave of Hesse, of the Cassel family, a very learned prince, seceded from the Lutheran church: and he not only himself went over to the Reformed, but also, in the year 1604, and subsequently, both at the university of Marpurg, and throughout his province, he displaced the Lutheran teachers who firmly resisted his purpose, and commanded the people to be thoroughly taught the Reformed doctrines, and public

worship to be conducted in the Genevan manner. This design was prosecuted with the greatest firmness, in the year 1619, when he ordered select theologians to proceed to the Dutch council of Dort, and commanded the decrees there made to be publicly assented to by his church. The Reformed maintained, formerly, that nothing was done in this affair, which was inconsistent with equity and the highest moderation. But perhaps all impartial men, in our day, will admit without difficulty, that many things would have been ordered somewhat differently, if that excellent prince had been less disposed to gratify his own will and pleasure, and more attentive to those precepts, which the wisest of the Reformed themselves inculcate, respecting our duty towards those who differ from us in matters of religion.¹

§ 2. Not long after, in the year 1614, John Sigismund also, the elector of Brandenburg, left the communion of the Lutherans, and went over to the Reformed: yet with different views from those of Maurice, and with different results. For he did not embrace all the doctrines by which the followers of Calvin are distinguished from the Lutherans; but, in addition to the Genevan form of worship, he only considered the Reformed doctrines respecting the person of Christ, and the presence of his body and blood in the Eucharist, as more correct and tenable than the Lutheran views: but what they inculcate respecting the nature and order of divine grace, and the decrees of God, he

¹ See Helv. Garth's *Historischer Bericht von dem Religionswesen im Fürstenthum Hessen*, 1606, 4to. Ern. Solom. Cyprian's *Unterricht von kirchlicher Vereinigung der Protestanten*, p. 263, and in the *Appendix of Documents*, p. 103, and the public Acts, which were published in the *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, A.D. 1749, p. 25, &c. Here should be consulted, especially, the writings that passed between the divines of Cassel and Darmstadt, which have a public character (Cassel, 1632, fol.; Marburg, 1636, fol.; Giess. 1647, fol.), of which Christ Aug. Salig treats in his *Historie der Augsburg. Confession*, vol. i. book iv. ch. ii. p. 756, &c. [From the time of the reformation, there were persons in Hesse who were inclined to the doctrines of the Reformed; but outward tranquillity was not thereby destroyed. Philip the Magnanimous, and his successors, some of whom were not obscurely favourable to the Reformed opinions, used all care to preserve this harmony. When the *Formula, of Concord* produced so much disturbance in Saxony and Upper Germany, and threatened to destroy the peace which Hesse had hitherto enjoyed, the Hessian princes published an edict in 1572, by which they endeavoured to preserve the union. Also in the general synods of Treysa in 1577, of Marburg in 1578, and of Cassel in 1579, the Hessian clergy were required to subscribe certain articles, designed to preserve the

union. But under the Landgrave Maurice, the state of things changed. He had been drawn over to the side of the Reformed, by some French Reformed noblemen's sons, whom his father had procured through Beza to be his son's associates; and after the death of his father's brother, the Landgrave Lewis, at Marburg, in 1604, he endeavoured to introduce the Reformed religion, by means of a Catechism: and in 1605 he dismissed all the teachers at Marburg, and in half the upper principality of Hesse (which had fallen to the house of Cassel), because they would not subscribe the result of the Synod without some limitation; and he established Reformed teachers in their place. The dismissed teachers, among whom the famous Balthazar Manzer was the most distinguished, were afterwards received by the Landgrave of Darmstadt, Lewis; and a part of them were established in the newly-erected university of Giessen, and the rest were beneficed elsewhere. Both parties were in fault: the Lutherans adhered too wilfully to certain subtle doctrines of the schools, and to external rites which are not of the essence of Christianity: and the Reformed, who had the court on their side, misused the power which was in their hands, to the injury of the ancient rights of a community, whose brethren they pretended to be. *Schl.*]

did not adopt. And hence, he did not send deputies to the synod of Dort, nor would he have their decrees respecting these difficult points to be received. The same sentiments were so far retained by the sovereign princes of Brandenburg who reigned after him, that they never required Calvin's doctrine of absolute decrees to be taught in the Reformed churches of their dominions, as the public and received doctrine. It is also justly accounted an honour to *John Sigismund*, that he gave his subjects full liberty, either to follow the example of their prince or to deviate from it; nor did he exclude from posts of honour and power, those who deemed it wrong to abandon the religion of their fathers. Yet this moderation was not satisfactory to the violent temper of that age, which was in many respects too rigid: for not a few thought it intolerable and improper in the prince to order that the professors of both religions should enjoy equal rank and rights; that odious terms and comparisons should be abstained from in disputation; that religious controversies should be either wholly omitted, or explained very modestly, in public discourses to the people; and lastly, that those who disagreed should live together as friends and interchange kind offices. And from these views originated not only bitter contests, but also at times rash and seditious commotions in the state; in allaying which, many years were consumed in vain. The neighbouring divines of Saxony, and particularly those of Wittemberg, undertook to defend the side of the Lutherans in these tumults; and undoubtedly with sincere and upright intentions, but, according to the custom of the times, in a style too coarse, and not sufficiently temperate. And hence, not only was the Formula of Concord excluded from a place among the books by which the public religion of the Lutherans is regulated, in the Brandenburg territories, but likewise the citizens of Brandenburg were forbidden to study theology in the university of Wittemberg.¹

§ 3. So many evils resulting from the discords of those who with equal sincerity and fortitude had renounced papal servitude, that is, of the Lutherans and Reformed, might suggest to some of the principal men, and the most famous theologians of both parties, to look about them, anxiously, for some means of uniting in bonds of mutual affection the communities rent asunder and severed by their religious

¹ The laws and edicts both of John Sigismund and his successors, in relation to this famous affair, have been sometimes printed together. There is likewise extant a great number of books and pamphlets, from which a knowledge of these proceedings may be derived; and of which I would rather refer to others for a full catalogue, than give an imperfect one myself. Such a catalogue is extant in the *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, A.D. 1745, p. 34, &c. and A.D. 1746, p. 326. See also, Jo. Charles Köcher, *Bibliotheca Theol. Symbolica*, p. 312, &c. Those who wish to understand and form an estimate of the whole transaction, may consult Godf. Arnold's *Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*, pt. ii.

book xvii. ch. vii. p. 965. Ern. Solom. Cyprian's *Unterricht von der Vereinigung der Protestanten*, p. 75, and the *Appendix of Documents*, p. 225. The *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, A.D. 1727, p. 1069, and A.D. 1732, p. 715. Those who would persuade us, that the hope of extending his power and influence was not the least motive with the prince for this change, conjecture, rather than demonstrate and prove; for they do not support their opinion with valid arguments. Yet it must be confessed, by such as carefully inspect the history of those times, that they do not conjecture altogether irrationally and without plausibility.

sentiments. No wise man could be so ignorant of human nature as to expect that all difference of opinion between them could be removed, or that either party would adopt the sentiments of the other. And therefore those who undertook this business agreed that their only aim should be, to persuade the disputants, that there was little or nothing of any importance to true religion and piety, in all the points controverted between the parties; that the fundamental truths, on which the plan of salvation rests, are safe on both sides; and that their controversies related, partly to things recondite and inexplicable, and partly to things indifferent and far removed from the supreme object of a Christian. Those who could admit these things to be true, must also admit, that the existing difference of sentiment was no just impediment to fraternal intercourse between the dissentients. And most of the Reformed were readily brought to concede that the Lutherans erred but moderately and lightly, or did not greatly corrupt any one of the primary doctrines of Christianity: but most of the Lutherans perseveringly maintained, that they had the most weighty reasons for not judging in the same manner of the Reformed, and that a great part of the dispute related to the groundwork of all religion and piety. It is not strange, that this perseverance of the Lutherans was branded by the opposite party with the odious names of moroseness, superciliousness, arrogance, and the like. But those who were taxed with these crimes, brought as many charges against their accusers. For they complained, that they were not treated ingenuously; that the real character of the Reformed principles was disguised, under ambiguous phraseology; and that their adversaries, though cautious and guarded, yet gave much proof that the chief ground of their great inclination for peace, was not so much a desire of the public good, as of their private advantage.

§ 4. Among the public transactions relative to this business of a union, we may justly give the first place to the project of *James I.*, the king of Great Britain; who attempted, in the year 1615, a reconciliation of the Lutherans and Reformed, through the instrumentality of *Peter du Moulin*, a very celebrated divine among the French Reformed.¹ The next place is due to the celebrated decree of the Reformed church of France, passed in the synod of Charenton, A.D. 1631; by which the Lutheran religion was declared harmless, holy, and free from all gross errors; and a way was opened for the professors of it to hold sacred and civil communion with the Reformed.² Whatever may have been the motives for this decree, its

¹ See Mich. le Vassor's *Histoire de Louis XIII.* t. ii. pt. ii. p. 21, &c. [and Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch. seit der Reform.* v. 198. Tr.]

² Elias Benoit's *Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes*, ii. 524. Jac. Aymon's *Actes des Synodes Nationaux des Eglises Réformées de France*, ii. 500, &c. Thomas Ittig's *Diss. de Synodi Carentoniensis Indulgentia erga Lutheranos*, Lips. 1705, 4to. [Quick's

Synodicon in Gallia Reformata, ii. 297. The words of the decree were these: 'The province of Burgundy demanding, whether the faithful of the Augustan (Augsburg) Confession might be permitted to contract marriages in our churches, and to present children in our churches unto baptism, without a precedaneous abjuration of those opinions held by them, contrary to the

effects were unimportant, for few of the Lutherans were disposed to use the liberty thus generously offered them. In the same year, certain Saxon theologians, *Matthias Hoe*, *Polycarp Lyser*, and *Henry Höpfner*, were ordered to hold a conference at Leipsic, with certain Hessian and Brandenburg doctors of the first class; so that the sentiments of both parties being properly explained and compared, it might be better understood, what and how great difficulties were in the way of the much desired union. This deliberation was conducted without any intemperate heat, or lust for disputation and controversy; but, at the same time, not with that mutual confidence and freedom from jealousy, which would secure harmony in the result. For though the speakers on the side of the Reformed explained in the best manner the views of their church, and cheerfully conceded not a few things which the Lutherans hardly expected, yet the suspicions of the latter, lest they should be entrapped, so intimidated them, that they would not acknowledge themselves satisfied. Hence the disputants separated without accomplishing anything.¹ Whoever wishes to learn the causes of these deliberations for peace must inspect and examine the civil history of those times.

§ 5. The conference at Thorn, in 1645, appointed by *Uladislaus IV.*, king of Poland, for the purpose of uniting, if possible, not only the Reformed with the Lutherans, but also both with the Papists, was likewise unsuccessful; for those who were called together to make efforts, if not to terminate, yet to lessen the existing enmities, separated more enraged than when they came together. With more success, by order of *William VI.*, the landgrave of Hesse, *Peter Musæus* and *John Henrichius*, of the university of Rinteln, and *Sebastian Curtius* and *John Heinius*, doctors of Marburg, the two former Lutherans, and the latter Reformed, whom *William*, landgrave of Hesse, directed to enter into a friendly discussion, compared their sentiments at Cassel in the year 1661. For having examined the essential importance of those controversies which separated the two communities, they mutually shook hands, affirming that it was

belief of our churches, this Synod declareth, that inasmuch as the churches of the Confession of Augsburg do agree with the other reformed churches, in the principal and fundamental points of the true religion, and that there is neither superstition nor idolatry in their worship, the faithful of the said Confession, who with a spirit of love and peaceableness do join themselves to the communion of our churches in this kingdom, may be, without any abjuration at all made by them, admitted unto the Lord's table with us; and as sureties, may present children unto baptism, they promising the Consistory, that they will never solicit them, either directly or indirectly, to transgress the doctrine believed and professed in our churches, but will be content to instruct and educate them in

those points and articles which are in common between us and them, and wherein both the Lutherans and we are unanimously agreed.' *Tr.]*

¹ See Timann Gesselius, *Historia Sacra et Ecclesiastica*, pt. ii. the Addenda, p. 597—613, where the Acts themselves are given. Jo. Wolfg. Jaeger's *Hist. Sæculi XVII.* decenn. iv. p. 497, &c. [The Reformed divines were John Bergius, court preacher at Berlin, John Crocius, professor at Marburg, and Theophilus Neuberger, superintendent at Cassel. They discussed all the articles of the Augsburg Confession, which the Reformed were ready to subscribe to, and also set forth a *Formula* of union, or rather an exposition of the articles in controversy, which was not expected from them. *Schl.]*

far less than was commonly supposed, and ought not to prevent fraternal affection and harmony. But the divines of Rinteln were so utterly unable to persuade their brethren to believe as they did; that, on the contrary, their only reward was almost universal hatred; and they were attacked with bitterness in numerous publications.¹ How much labour and effort the Brandenburg heroes, *Frederic William* and his son *Frederic*, afterwards expended in reconciling the differences of protestants in general, and particularly in Prussia² and their other provinces, and what difficulties opposed and withstood those efforts, is too well known to need a long rehearsal.

§ 6. Of those who, as private individuals, assumed the office of arbiters of the contests among the protestants, a vast number might be mentioned; but many more among the Reformed than among the Lutherans assumed this character. The most noted among the Reformed, as all agree, was *John Dureau*,³ a Scotchman, who was certainly an honest man, pious, and learned; but more distinguished for genius and memory, than for the power of nice discrimination and sound judgment; as might be demonstrated by satisfactory proofs, if this were the proper place for them. For more than forty years, or from 1631 to 1674, he tried with incredible fortitude and patience, by writing, persuading, admonishing, in short, in every way that could be thought of, to attain the happiness of putting an end to the contests among the protestants. Nor, like others, did he attempt this vast enterprise shut up in his study; but he travelled himself into nearly all the countries of Europe, in which a purer religion flourished, and personally addressed and conferred with all the theologians of both parties, who were of much note and influence, and made great exertions to engage in his enterprise kings, princes and magistrates, and their friends, by displaying the importance and utility of his object. Most persons commended his designs, and treated him with kindness: yet very few were found willing to help forward his plans by their personal efforts and counsels. Some persons suspecting that so great eagerness as they perceived in *Dury* must proceed from sinister designs, and that he was secretly labouring to draw the Lutherans into a snare, assailed him in their writings, not without acrimony; nor did all of them abstain from direct invectives and reproaches. At last, neglected by his own party, and repelled and rejected by ours, and wearied out by a thousand hardships, insults, and troubles, he learned that this task exceeded the power of private efforts; and he consumed the remainder of his life

¹ The writers who treat of the conferences at Thorn and Cassel, are enumerated by Caspar Sagittarius, *Introduct. ad Historiam Ecclesiast.* ii. 1604. Add Jo. Wolff. Jaeger's *Historia Sæculi XVII.* decenn. v. p. 689, where the Acts of the conference of Thorn, — and decenn. vii. p. 160, where those of the conference at Cassel, are extant. Jo. Alphonso Turretine, *Nubes Testium pro moderato in rebus Theologicis Judicio*, p. 178.

Jo. Müller, in his *Life of Musæus*, in *Cimbria Litterata*, ii. 566, &c. treats professedly of the conference at Cassel; and in p. 568, gives an accurate catalogue of all the writings published both by the friends and the enemies of that conference.

² Christ. Hartknoch's *Preussische Kirchenhistorie*, p. 599. *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, A.D. 1731, p. 1010, &c.

³ [Or *Dury*. *Tr.*]

in obscurity and neglect at Cassel.¹ This man, honest, though sometimes not sufficiently explicit and ingenuous, laid for the foundation of his scheme certain principles, according to which, if they should be approved, not only Lutherans and the Reformed, but Christians of all sects whatever, might easily become associated. For first he contended that what is called the *Apostles' Creed* embraced all the doctrines necessary to be believed, and the ten commandments all the laws of conduct to be observed, and the Lord's prayer all the promises of God: and if this were true, then all Christians might unite in one family. In the next place, as appears from adequate proof, he endeavoured to attain his object by means of mystical or Quakerish sentiments. For he placed all religion in the elevation of the soul to God, or in eliciting that internal divine spark, or word, that dwells in the human mind; from which it would follow, that difference of opinion on divine subjects has no connexion with religion.

§ 7. The principal Lutherans who engaged in this business were *John Matthiæ*, a Swede, bishop of Strengnas, and formerly preceptor to queen *Christina*, whom *Dury* had warmed with zeal for a coalition; and *George Calixtus*, a divine of Helmstadt, who had few equals in that age, either in learning, genius, or probity: but neither of these met with the success that he had hoped for. The *Olive Branches* of the former (for such was the title of his pamphlets on the subject) were publicly condemned; and by a royal edict were excluded from the territories of Sweden. And he himself, at last, in order to make some sort of peace with his enemies, was compelled to relinquish his office, and retire to a private life.²

¹ See Jo. Christopher Coler's *Historia Joh. Duræi*, Wittemb. 1716, 4to, to which, however, very much might be added, from documents both printed and manuscript. Some documents of this kind were published by Theodore Haseus, in the *Bibliotheca Bremensis. Theologico-Philologica*, i. 911, &c. and iv. 683. A great number are given by Timann Gesselius, in the *Addenda Irenica*, in his *Hist. Eccles.* ii. 614. His transactions with the Marpurgers, are in Tilemann von Schenck's *Vitæ Professorum Theol. Marpurgensium*, p. 202, &c. What he attempted in Holstein, may be learned from the Epistles which Adam Henry Lackmann published along with the Epistles of Luke Lossius, p. 245. How he conducted himself in Prussia and Poland, we are informed by Dan. Ern. Jablonsky, *Hist. Consensus Sandomiriensis*, p. 127. His proceedings in Denmark are stated by Jac. Herm. von Elswich, *Fasciculus i. Epistolar. Familiarium Theologicar.* p. 147. His acts in the Palatinate are in Jo. Henry von Seelen's *Dehlicia Epistolica*, p. 353. His proceedings in Switzerland are illustrated by the Acts and Epistles, published in the *Museum*

Helveticum, t. iii. iv. v. p. 602, &c. Many things, also, on this subject, are brought forward in Jo. Wolfg. Jaeger's *Hist. Sæculi XVII. decenn.* vii. p. 172, and elsewhere. In general, respecting Duræus, the reader may consult Anth. Wilh. Böhm's *Englische Reformations-historie*, p. 944, and the Dissertation, derived very much from unpublished documents, which Charles Jasper Benzel exhibited at Helmstadt, under my auspices, in 1744, entitled: *de Joh. Duræo, maxime de Actis ejus Suecanis*. [See also Peter Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, art. *Duræus*; Godfr. Arnold's *Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*, pt. ii. b. xvii. ch. xi. § 23, &c. p. 152, &c. and Brook's *Lives of the Puritans*, iii. 369, &c. *Tr.*]

² See Jo. Scheffer's *Suecia Litterata*, p. 123, and Jo. Möller's *Hypomnemata* upon it, p. 387. Arckenholz, *Mémoires de la Reine Christine*, i. 320, 505, &c. ii. 63. [Matthiæ published two works, which gave offence to the Swedes, namely, *Idea boni Ordinis in Ecclesia Christi*; and *Ramus Olivæ Septentrionalis*. The last was published in ten parts, Strengnas, 1661, 1662, 12mo, and in the latter year was placed in the list of the forbidden books. *Tr.*]

Calixtus, while he dissuaded others from contention, drew on himself an immense load of accusations and conflicts; and while he endeavoured to free the church from all sects, was thought by great numbers of his brethren to be the father and author of a new sect, that of the Syncretists, a kind of people who pursue peace and union at the expense of divine truth.¹ We shall find hereafter a more convenient place for speaking of the fortunes and the opinions of this great man; for he was charged with many other offences besides that of being zealous for peace with the Reformed; and the attacks made upon him threw the whole Lutheran community into commotion.

§ 8. To say something of the external prosperity of the Lutheran church, the most important circumstance is, that although it was beset by its enemies with numberless machinations and oppressions, it could nowhere be entirely extirpated and obliterated. There are to this day, and it may justly excite our wonder, very many Lutherans even in those countries in which Lutheran worship is prohibited: nay (as appears from the recent emigration of the Saltz-burgers,² which deserves to be told to all future ages), in those countries in which even a silent and most cautious dissent from the established religion is a capital crime, there lie concealed vast numbers who regard all superstition with abhorrence, and who observe in the best manner they can the great precepts of a purified religion. The countries which are inhabited by persons of different religions, yet are under the spiritual dominion of the Roman pontiff, afford us numerous examples of cruelty, inhumanity, and injustice, which the Romanists think perfectly justifiable against those who dissent from them, and whom they regard as seditious citizens: yet nowhere could either violence or fraud wrest from the Lutherans all their rights and liberties. It may be added that the Lutheran religion was transplanted by merchants and other emigrants into America, Asia, and Africa; and was introduced into various places of Europe, where it was before unknown.

§ 9. The internal condition of the Lutheran church in this century presents indeed many things to be commended, but not a few things also that deformed it. First, it was most honourable to the Lutherans that they cultivated everywhere with diligence not only sacred learning, but also every branch of human knowledge; and that they enlarged and illustrated both literature and theology with many and important accessions. Most people know this: nor does the nature of our undertaking allow us to give a long enumeration of revolutions and improvements in the several branches of learning. From the bulk of them religion derived some benefit, but some of them were

¹ The views of this excellent man, which many have stated incorrectly, may be learned from his tract, often printed, with the title: *Judicium de Controversiis Theologicis inter Lutheranos et Reformatos, et de mutua partium fraternitate et tolerantia.*

² [There was an emigration of over one thousand Saltzburgers, in 1684, 1685, 1686: but the great emigration was in 1731, and onwards, amounting to between 30,000 and 40,000 persons. *Tr.*—See Carlyle's *Fredrick the Great*, ii. 409. *Ed.*]

abused by injudicious or ill-designing men—such is the common lot of all human affairs—to corrupt and to explain away that religion which the Bible reveals. In the first part of the century, those branches of learning in which intellect is chiefly concerned were the most taught in the schools; in a way and manner, too, but little attractive or intelligible: in the latter part of it, more attention was paid to the branches which depend on genius and memory, and which afford more entertainment and pleasure, such as history, civil as well as literary and natural, antiquities, criticism, eloquence, and the like. Moreover, both kinds of learning were treated in a more convenient, neat, and elegant manner. Yet it was unhappily the fact, that while human knowledge was advanced and polished, the estimation in which learning and learned men were held was gradually lessened; which, among other causes that are better passed over in silence, may be ascribed to the multitude of those who applied themselves to literature, in spite of a cast of character and turn of mind fitted for a different way of life.

§ 10. During the greatest part of the century no other rule of philosophizing flourished in the schools except the Aristotelico-Scholastic: and for a long time those who thought that *Aristotle* should either be given up or amended, were considered as threatening as much danger to the church as if they had undertaken to falsify some portion of the Bible. In this zeal for the Peripatetic philosophy, the doctors of Leipsic, Tübingen, Helmstadt, and Altorf, went beyond almost all others. Many indeed envied Aristotle his high reputation. In the first place, there were certain wise and honest men among the theologians who admitted that it was proper to philosophize, though briefly, but who complained that the name of philosophy was attached to words and distinctions void of all meaning.¹ Next came the disciples of *Peter Ramus*; who with great diligence inculcated the precepts of their master, which were of greater practical utility, in many both of the higher and inferior schools, to the exclusion of the Aristotelians.² Lastly, there were those who either condemned all philosophy as injurious to religion and to the community (which *Daniel Hoffmann* did no less unskilfully than contentiously at Helmstadt), or who, with *Robert Fludd* and *Jacob Böhmen* (already mentioned³), boasted of having discovered, by the help of fire and heavenly light within, an admirable and celestial mode of philosophizing. But if there had been as much harmony among those sects as there was dissension and disagreement, they had far less power than was necessary to overthrow the empire of *Aristotle*, now confirmed by time, and strong in the multitude of its defenders.

§ 11. But more danger impended over *Aristotle* from *Des Cartes*

¹ Such was Wenzel Schilling, with his associates (concerning whom see Godfr. Arnold's *Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*, pt. ii. book xvii. ch. vi. p. 949), and others of our best theologians.

² See Jo. Herm. von Elswich, *de Varia*

Aristotelis in Protestant. Scholis Fortuna, § xxi. p. 54, &c., and Jo. Geo. Walch's *Historia Logics*, l. ii. cap. i. sect. iii. § 5, in his *Parerga Academica*, p. 613, &c.

³ See above, the general history of the church, § 30, &c.

and *Gassendi*, whose lucid and well-arranged treatises, as early as the middle of the century, better pleased many of our theologians than the numerous huge volumes of the Peripatetics, in which the stale and insipid wisdom of the schools was exhibited without taste or elegance. These new teachers of philosophy, the Aristotelians first endeavoured to repel by arguments of an invidious nature, copiously displaying the great danger which this new mode of philosophizing portended to religion and to true piety; and afterwards, when they saw these weapons unsuccessful, by retreating a little, and defending only the citadel of their cause and abandoning the outworks. For some of them coupled elegance of diction and polite literature with their precepts; nor did they deny that there were in *Aristotle*, though he was the prince of philosophers, some blemishes and faults which a wise man might lawfully amend. But this very prudence made their adversaries more bold and daring: for they now contended that they had obliged them to confess themselves guilty; and therefore opened all their batteries upon the whole school of the Stagirite, the need of a partial amendment in which had only been conceded by the other side. After *Hugo Grotius*, who was but a timid opponent of the Stagirite, *Samuel Puffendorf* first pointed out, freely and openly, a new and very different course from the Peripatetic on the law of nature and science of morals. He was followed, and with a spirit far above his own, in spite of the multifarious enmity that had nearly overwhelmed him, by *Christian Thomasius*, a jurist first of Leipsic, and then of Halle; who was not, indeed, a man to whose protection the interests of philosophy might be intrusted with entire confidence, but still one who had a fearless mind and a very superior genius. He attempted a reformation, not of a single science only, but of every branch of philosophy; and both by words and by example continually urged his fellow-citizens to burst asunder the bonds of *Aristotle*; whom, however, he did not understand, nor had he even read him. The particular mode of philosophizing, which he substituted in place of that which had prevailed, was not very favourably received, and soon fell into neglect: but the spirit of innovation which he diffused, made so great a progress in a short time, that he may be justly accounted the subduer of philosophic tyranny, or of *sectarian philosophy*, especially among the Germans.¹ The Frederician university, founded at Halle

¹ [Concerning Christian Thomasius, see Brucker's *Historia Crit. Philosophiæ*, t. v. and his *Append. Hist. Crit. Philos.* p. 859, &c. Yet Mosheim judged more correctly of this memorable man than Brucker did, who unjustly accounted him a reformer of philosophy. Thomasius was not properly a reformer of philosophy, though he was the occasion of a reform in it; for he improved the philosophical genius of the Germans, just as Holberg did that of the Danes, without being himself a great discoverer. Thomasius introduced more freedom of thinking.

And this freedom, under his guidance, spread itself not only over philosophy, but over ecclesiastical law. He often went too far in this matter; and his views were not always the best. The abuse he received from the divines of Leipsic, inflamed him with hatred against the whole clerical order. At the same time, he must have the credit of abolishing the punishment of heretics, trials for witchcraft, and certain false principles respecting marriage and divorce, &c. See Prof. Schroeckh's *Allgem. Biographie*, v. 266, &c. *Schl.*]

in Saxony, where he taught, was the first to fall in with his views: afterwards the other schools in Germany adopted them one after another: and from these a liberty of thinking passed over to other countries that agreed with us in religion. Towards the end of the century, therefore, all among us became possessed, not by any law, but in the course of events, and as it were accidentally, of the liberty of philosophizing each according to his own judgment and not another man's: and of exhibiting in public those principles of philosophy which each one thought to be true and certain. This liberty was so used by the major part, that, in the manner of the ancient *Eclectics*, they selected and combined the better and more probable dogmas of the various schools; yet there were some, among whom *Godfrey William Leibnitz* was the greatest man, who endeavoured to search for the truth by their own efforts, and to elicit from fixed and immoveable principles a new and imperishable philosophy.¹ In this conflict with *Aristotle* and his friends, so great was the odium against the routed foe, among the Lutherans, that the science of *metaphysics*, which he regarded as the primary science, and the source of all the rest, was degraded and nearly stripped of all its honours; nor could the otherwise great influence of *Des Cartes*, who like *Aristotle* commenced all his philosophy with it, afford to it any protection. But after the first commotions had a little subsided, principally at the recommendation of *Leibnitz*, it was not only recalled from exile, but was also again honoured with the splendid title and rank of the queen of sciences.

§ 12. Many persons, who have formed such an idea of the Christian church as no wise men will ever expect to see realised, are wonderfully copious in enumerating and exaggerating the defect of the Lutheran clergy of this age. In the higher class of them, they mention arrogance, a contentious spirit, disregard of Christian simplicity, lust of domination, a carping disposition, intolerable bigotry, extreme hatred of pious and good men who may honestly deviate at all from the established rule of faith; and I know not what other things no better than these. In the lower class of ministers they mention ignorance, an inept mode of teaching, and neglect of their most sacred duties; and in both classes, avarice, the want of piety, indolence, and habits unbecoming the character of ministers of Christ. One who has leisure and the means of examining the morals and the state of those times, will readily grant that there was not a small number of persons presiding over the Lutheran churches, deficient either in the ability or the disposition to point out the way of truth and of salvation wisely and well. But such as are acquainted with human affairs know this to have been the common evil of all ages. And on the other hand, no one will deny—unless he is ignorant and ill-informed, or is affected by some disease of the mind—that there were very many learned, grave, wise, and holy men, intermingled with such as

¹ No one will better illustrate all these facts than Jac. Brucker, the man best informed on all these subjects, in his *Historia Critica Philosophiæ*.

cannot be defended. And, perhaps, if one should raise this question—Whether in the times of our fathers, or in our own times (in which, as many think, the ancient sanctity of the clergy is revived in numerous places), there were the most preachers in our churches unworthy of their office—a difficult controversy would come up, in which a person of any genius might easily find arguments on both sides. Besides, many of the faults so invidiously charged upon the clergy of this age, if the subject be duly examined, will be found not so much the faults of the men as of the *times*; of those public calamities, in fact, which flowed from the thirty years' war, a most fruitful mother of a great many ills in Germany. Some of the blame, too, must be laid upon a faulty education, nor can the civil power be wholly acquitted of it.

§ 13. This last charge will be better understood if we notice some particulars. We do not deny, what many allege, that during a great part of the century the people were not well instructed and taught, either from the pulpit, or in the schools; nor shall we much resist those who maintain that the sacred eloquence of many places was the art of declaiming boisterously, by the hour, on subjects little understood or comprehended. For though the doctrines and precepts of religion were generally brought forward, yet by most preachers they were dressed out in puerile ornaments, very foreign from the spirit of divine wisdom; and thus were in a measure deprived of their native force and beauty. Yet who can greatly wonder that those men should have amplified their discourses with adventitious matter, who had but very few examples of good speaking before them, and who brought to the sacred office heads full of philosophical terms and distinctions and quibbles, but empty of those things which are of most use for moving the souls of men? We acknowledge, that in the universities more time was spent in the study of polemic theology, and in stating and clearing the doctrines of theology with subtlety and art, than in explaining the holy Scriptures, in unfolding the principles of morals, in imbuing the mind with pious emotions, and in other things necessary in a minister of religion. Yet this fault, I think, will be censured with less severity by one who has learned from the history of those times with what zeal and subtlety numerous adversaries attacked the Lutheran cause, and to what dangers it was exposed from those adversaries, especially from the papists. When war rages on every side, the art of war and of defending one's country, it is well known, is commonly regarded as the most valuable of all arts. I wish they had shown more mildness towards great numbers, who from excessive curiosity, or from ignorance, or the ardour of their imaginations, fell into errors, yet did not disturb the public peace with their opinions. But from education, and from their earliest impressions (which are well known to have boundless influence), our ancestors derived the sentiment that corruptors of divine truth ought to be restrained. And the more simplicity and attachment to the divine glory they possessed, the more difficult was it for them to discard the maxim, transfused into their minds from the ecclesiastical law of the papists, that who-

ever is adjudged an enemy of God, should be adjudged an enemy of his country.

§ 14. In the form of church government, the mode of worship, and other external regulations of our church, little or no change was made in most places. Yet many and great changes would have been made, if the princes had deemed it for the public good to regulate ecclesiastical matters according to the prescriptions of certain great and excellent men, who, near the close of the century, led on by *Christian Thomasius*, attempted a reformation of our system of ecclesiastical law. These famous jurists, in the first place, set up a new fundamental principle of church polity, namely, the supreme authority and power of the civil magistrate: and then, after establishing with great care and subtlety this basis, they founded upon it a great mass of precepts, which, in the judgment of many, were considered, and not without reason, as tending to this point, that the sovereign of a country is also sovereign of the religion of its citizens, or is their supreme pontiff; and that the ministers of religion are not to be accounted ambassadors of God, but vicegerents of the chief magistrates. They also weakened, not a little, the few prerogatives and advantages of the clergy, which were left of the vast number formerly possessed; and maintained that many of the maxims and regulations of our church, which had come down from our fathers, were relics of popish superstition. This afforded matter for long and pernicious feuds and contests between our theologians and our jurists. I leave others to inquire with what temper and designs, and with what success, these contests were managed on both sides. It will be sufficient for us to observe, what is acknowledged on all hands, that they have everywhere largely taken from the respect for the sacred order, as also from the dignity of religion itself, and from the prosperity and security of the whole Lutheran church. Wherefore, most unfortunately, such is the state of things among us, that those of honourable birth, or who are distinguished for strength of genius, or for noble and ingenuous feelings, look upon the study of theology as beneath them, there being neither honour nor much emolument attached to it; and every day the number of wise and erudite theologians is becoming less. This is lamented by those who see in what a perilous state the Lutheran cause now is: and perhaps those who come after us will have cause to lament it still more.

§ 15. With the names of celebrated men among the Lutherans, who have promoted their own reputations and the interests of the church by their writings, we might fill up several pages. It will be sufficient for the young theologian to acquaint himself well with the merits and the labours of the following: *Ægidius* and *Nicolas Hunnius*; *Leonard Hutter*; *John* and *John Ernest Gerhard*; *George* and *Frederic Ulric Calixtus*; the *Mentzers*; the *Oleariuses*; *Frederic Baldwin*; *Albrecht Grawer*; *Matthias Hoe*; the *Carpzovs*; *John* and *Paul Tarnovius*; *John Affelmann*; *Eilh. Lubin*; the *Lysers*; both the *Michael Walthers*; *Joachim Hildebrand*; *John Val. Andreæ*; *Solomon Glassius*; *Abraham Calovius*; *Theodore*

Hackspar; *John Hülsemann*; *James Weller*; the brothers, *Peter* and *John Musceus*; *John Conrad Danhauer*; *John George Dorschæus*; *John Arndt*; *Martin Geyer*; *John Adam Schertzer*; *Balthasar* and *John Meisner*; *Augustus Pfeiffer*; *Henry* and *John Müller*; *Justus Christopher Schomer*; *Sebastian Schmid*; *Christian Kortholt*; the *Osianders*; *Philip James Spener*; *Gebhard Theodore Meyer*; *Friedemann Bechmann*; and others.¹

¹ For the lives and writings of these men, see, besides the common writers of literary history, Henn. Witte, in his *Memorie Theologorum*, and his *Diarium Biographicum*; Henry Pipping, and George Henry Götte, in their *Memorie Theologorum*; and others. [The following brief notices are abridged from Schlegel and Von Einem.—Æg. Hunnius, born 1550, prof. of theology at Marburg, 1576, and at Wittemberg, 1592, where he died 1603, was a great polemic divine. His Latin works, 5 vols. fol. were printed, 1607—1609.—His son of the same name, superintendent at Altenburg, died 1642.—Nicholas Hunnius, prof. at Wittemb., and superintendent at Lubeck, died 1643. He wrote against the catholics; and a plan for terminating religious controversies.—Hutter died a prof. at Wittemb. in 1616. He was a bitter polemic against the Reformed.—John Gerhard, born 1582, prof. at Coburg and Jena, died 1637. His *Loci Communes*, enlarged by Cotta, are still in repute. His *Confessio Catholica* confutes the catholic theology, by the fathers, councils, and schoolmen.—His son, Jo. Ernest Gerhard, prof. of theology at Jena, died 1668, and his grandson of the same name, prof. of theology at Giessen, died 1707.—Geo. Calixtus, an elegant scholar, and a learned theologian, prof. at Helmstadt, died 1656. His conflicts are afterwards mentioned by Mosheim.—His son, Geo. Ulric Calixtus, trod in the steps of his father; but possessed less talent.—Balthazar Mentzer, the father, prof. at Marburg and Giessen, famous as a violent polemic against the Reformed, died 1627.—Balthazar Mentzer, the son, was prof. at Marburg, Rinteln, and Giessen; and died 1679.—John Olearius (or Oelschläger) who died 1628, prof. of Heb. at Helmst., and superintendent at Halle, was the parent of the others.—Jo. Godfr. Olearius, his son, succeeded his father at Halle.—Jo. Olearius, the grandson of John, was prof. of Gr. at Leipsic, wrote *De Stylo N. T.*, and died 1713.—Godfr. Olearius, son of the last, and great-grandson of the first John, was prof. of theology at Leipsic, and died 1715.—Fred. Baldwin was prof. of theology at Wittemb., wrote a *Comment. on Paul's Epistles*; *Cases of Conscience*, &c., and died 1627.—Grawer, prof. at Jena, and general

superintendent at Weimar, an angry polemic, and denominated the shield and sword of Lutheranism, died 1617.—Hoe was nobly born at Vienna; was a court preacher, and a strenuous adversary of the Reformed; and died in 1645.—Jo. Bened. Carpov, prof. of theology at Leipsic, wrote *Isagoge in Libros Symbol.*, and died 1657.—His son, Jo. Bened. Carpov, also prof. of theology at Leipsic, and famed for his Rabbinic learning, died 1699. His brother, Sam. Bened. Carpov, court preacher at Dresden, died 1707.—Jo. Tarnovius, prof. of theology at Rostock, a good interpreter, died 1629.—Paul Tarnovius, a kinsman of the former, and a prof. at Rostock, also a biblical interpreter, died in 1633.—Affelmann (or von Affeln) was an acute but angry disputant, prof. of theology at Rostock, and died 1624.—Lubin, professor, first of poetry, and then of theology, at Rostock, was an elegant scholar, and a good interpreter of Paul's Epistles; died 1621.—Polycarp Lyser, prof. of theology at Wittemberg, a zealous defender of Lutheranism, died 1610.—His son, Polycarp, prof. of theology at Leipsic, also an acute polemic, died 1633.—The brother of the last, William Lyser, was prof. of theol. at Wittemb., and died in 1649.—Walther, the father, prof. of theol. at Helmst., and then general superintendent of East Friesland, died at Zelle, 1662.—Walther, the son, was prof. of mathematics, and then of theology at Wittemberg, and died 1692.—Hildebrand, prof. of theology and ecclesiastical antiquities at Helmstadt, and then upper superintendent at Lüneburg, died 1671.—J. V. Andreæ, the son of John, and grandson of the famous chancellor James Andreæ of Tübingen, sustained various offices, court preacher, consistorial counsellor, &c. He was a great satirical genius, as well as profoundly learned; and was supposed to be the author of the Rosicrucian comedy; died 1654, aged 68.—Solomon Glass, author of *Philologia Sacra*, was born 1593, became prof. of Hebrew and Greek, and then of theology, at Jena, and lastly, general superintendent at Gotha, where he died, 1656. He was very learned and pious.—Calovius, prof. at Königsberg, rector at Dantzic, and professor of theology at Wittemberg, died 1686, aged 74. He was a learned dogmatic theologian, and

§ 16. No violence was publicly offered to the fundamental articles of religion, as professed by the Lutheran church: nor would any one easily have found toleration among the Lutheran doctors, if he had ventured to forsake, or to invalidate, the doctrines clearly defined and explained in what are called the *Symbolical* books. But in more modern times, from various causes, the high authority, once possessed by those rules of faith and doctrine, has, in many places, been much weakened and diminished. And hence arises the liberty, enjoyed by those who are not professed teachers in the church, of dissenting from the symbolical books; and of expressing that dissent at pleasure, both

severe against dissentients from Lutheranism.—Hackspan, a learned orientalist, professor of the oriental languages, and then of theology, at Altorf, died 1659, aged 52.—Hülsemann, a scholastic divine, was prof. of theology, first at Wittemberg, and then at Leipsic, where he died, 1661, aged 59. He strenuously opposed all union with the Reformed.—Weller, author of a famous Gr. Grammar, was a good teacher of the oriental languages and theology at Wittemberg, and then court preacher at Dresden; died 1664, aged 62.—Peter Musæus, a learned and moderate man, prof. of theology at Rinteln, Helmstadt, and Kiel, where he died, 1674, aged 54.—John Musæus, a judicious divine, first a prof. of history and poetry, and then of theology, at Jena; died 1681, aged 68. Both these brothers were liberal-minded men.—Danhauer, a poet and professor of theology at Strasburg, died 1666, aged 63.—Dorscheus of Strasburg, a prof. of theology there, and at Rostock, where he died, 1659, aged 62; was very learned.—Arndt, after various changes and persecutions, died general superintendent at Zelle, in 1621, aged 66; a very pious man, though mystical. See cent. xvi. sect. iii. pt. ii. c. i. § 2, note.—Geyer, a preacher and professor at Leipsic, and court preacher at Dresden; a devout man, a commentator on some books of the Old Testament, died 1680, aged 66.—Schertzer, professor of theology at Leipsic, a disciple of Hülsemann, author of a system of theology; died 1638, aged 55.—Balth. Meisner, of Dresden, prof. of theology at Wittemberg, a modest and liberal-minded man; died 1626, aged 39.—Jo. Meisner, prof. of theology at Wittemberg; much opposed by Calovius, for his liberal views; died 1681, aged 66.—Pfeiffer, a good orientalist and expositor, author of *Dubia vexata* and *Critica sacra*, was prof. of oriental languages and of theology, first at Wittemberg, and then at Leipsic, and superintendent at Lubeck, where he died, 1698, aged 58.—Henry Müller, a friend of Spener, preacher and prof. at Rostock, known by his practical writings, died 1675, aged 44.—Jo. Müller, a preacher at Hamburg, and

bitter opposer of Henry Müller and Jac. Boehmen, died 1672, aged 74.—Schomer of Lubeck, professor of theology at Rostock, died 1693, aged 45; and was a man of general knowledge.—Schmid, a native of Alsace and prof. at Strasburg, was learned in the oriental languages, and distinguished as a biblical interpreter. His Lat. translation of the Bible, and comment. on several books, did him much credit: he died 1696, aged 79.—Kortholt was professor of theology at Rostock, and then at Kiel, where he was vice-chancellor, and died 1694, aged 61. He advanced church history, and promoted piety and religious knowledge in the country around him.—Lucas Osiander, senior (son of Andrew Osiander, sen.), was court preacher, and consistorial counsellor at Stuttgart, and employed in promoting the reception of the Formula of Concord. He abridged and continued the Magdeburg centuries; and died 1604, aged 73.—Andrew Osiander (son of the former) became chancellor at Tübingen, and died 1617, aged 55, leaving nine children. He published a Latin Bible with notes.—Lucas Osiander, junior (son of Lucas Osiander, senior), prof. of theology, and chancellor at Tübingen; a violent polemic, and particularly hostile to Mentzer and Arndt; died 1638, aged 67.—John Adam Osiander (son of Jo. Balthazar Osiander, superintendent of Vaihingen) was court preacher at Stuttgart, prof. of Greek, and then of theology, and finally chancellor at Tübingen; a polemic divine; died 1697, aged 75.—Phil. Jac. Spener, of Upper Alsace, preacher at Strasburg, Frankfort, and at the court of Dresden, and provost of Berlin, where he died 1705, aged 76. He was learned and eloquent, and a great promoter of piety; and will be noticed hereafter.—Meyer, well read in ecclesiastical antiquities, was professor of theology at Helmstadt, where he died, 1693. He wrote *Commentar. de recondita Veteris Eccles. Theologia*; and published Justell's *Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Universæ*.—Bechmann was professor at Jena, and died in 1703. Tr.]

orally and in their writings. Formerly, such as opposed any article of the public religion, or disseminated new opinions among the people, were judicially arraigned; and could seldom escape without some loss of honour and emoluments, unless they would abjure their opinions. But no one feared anything of this kind after the principle, which the Arminians first zealously propagated, had gradually made its way among the Lutheran churches in the latter part of the seventeenth century; namely, that every man is accountable to God only for his religious opinions; and that it is wrong for the state to punish any man for his erroneous faith, provided he does nothing to disturb the public tranquillity. It were to be wished that this liberty of opinion (which every one will approve in proportion to his equity and his confidence in his own virtue) had not degenerated into the unbridled licentiousness of treating everything sacred and salutary with utter contempt, and of attacking, with amazing wantonness, the honour both of religion and its ministers.

§ 17. The study of the sacred Scriptures was never intermitted among the Lutherans; nor were they at any time without skilful interpreters of them, or trusty guides to the commentaries produced. To say nothing of *Tarnovius*, *Gerhard*, *Hackspar*, *Calixtus*, *Erasmus Schmid*, and the many other famous expounders of the divine books, there was published, at the very time which some tax with the greatest neglect of this kind of studies, the immortal work of *Solomon Glassius*, entitled *Philologia Sacra*; than which no work can be a more useful help for understanding the language of the divine Scriptures. Still it must be confessed, that during a large part of the century, most of the doctors in the universities were more occupied in explaining and defending with subtlety the dogmas and tenets of the church, than in expounding that volume whence all solid knowledge of them must be derived. Yet if in this there was anything reprehensible, the subsequent theologians caused the interests of the Lutheran religion to derive little injury from it. For as soon as the commotions produced by the wars and controversies, particularly with the papists, had begun to subside, great numbers applied themselves to the exposition of the Scriptures; to which they were excited and quickened very much, if I do not misjudge, by the industry of those Dutch theologians who followed after *Cocceius*. At the head of these later interpreters may be placed, perhaps, *Sebastian Schmid*; whom, at least, no one has exceeded in the number of his productions. Next to him, *Abraham Calovius*, *Martin Geyer*, *Schomer*, and others, most deserve to be mentioned.¹ The *Pietistic* controversies, though otherwise most lamentable, were at last attended with this among other consequences, that greater numbers than before applied themselves to the careful reading of the holy Scriptures, and to meditation on their contents. The merits of these expositors, as must be the case, were unequal. Some investigated merely the import of the words and

¹ The reader may here consult Jo. Fran. Buddeus, *Isagoge in Theologiam*, lib. ii. cap. viii. p. 1686, &c.

the sense of the text. Others, besides this, encountered adverse parties, and either confuted false expositions, or brought forth true ones for the subversion of erroneous opinions. Others, after exhibiting briefly the sense of the [inspired] writer, applied it to morals and to instruction in Christian duty. Some are represented, and perhaps not unjustly, as having, by assiduously reading the books of the Cocceians, fallen into certain faults of theirs; and as inconsiderately turning the sacred histories into allegories, by searching after recondite and remote senses rather than the obvious sense of the words.

§ 18. The principal divines of this century, at first, presented the doctrines of religion derived from the Scriptures, in a loose and disconnected form, after the manner of *Melancthon*; that is, arranged under general heads (*Loci Communes*): yet this did not prevent them from employing the terms, the distinctions, and the definitions of the then reigning and admired Peripatetic philosophy, in the explanation and statement of particular doctrines. Afterwards, *George Calixtus*, who was himself addicted to the Aristotelian philosophy, first clothed theology in a philosophic dress; that is, reduced it to the form of a science, or system of truths: but he was censured by many, not so much for doing such a thing, as because he did not give to this most sacred science a suitable form. For he divided the whole science into three parts, *the object, the subject, and the means*; which, though accordant with the precepts of *Aristotle*, to whom he was exclusively attached, was, in the opinion of some, an unsuitable distribution.¹ A number of the best teachers, however, eagerly adopted that arrangement; and, even in our times, there are some who commend it, and follow it in practice. Some arranged religious doctrines in a different manner: but they had not many imitators. In the mean time, there were many respectable and pious men, all through the century, who were very much displeased with this mode of teaching theology philosophically, and of combining sacred truths with the dictates of philosophy: they earnestly desired to see all human subtleties and nice speculation laid aside, and theology exhibited just as God exhibits it in the holy Scriptures; that is, in a simple, perspicuous, popular form, cleared and freed wholly from any philosophical fetters. These persons were gratified to some extent, as the century drew to a close, when *Philip James Spener*, and not a few others, animated by his exhortations and example, began to treat on religious subjects with more freedom and clearness; and when the Eclectics drove the Peripatetic philosophy from the schools. *Spener* could not indeed persuade *all* to follow his method; yet he persuaded a great many. Nor

¹ [This distribution into the *object, subject, and means* in theology, may be understood, by considering what parts of theology he placed under each of these heads. Under the *first*, he considered man's supreme good, the immortality of the soul, the resurrection, the last judgment, eternal blessedness and damnation. Under the *second*, he considered

the doctrines concerning God, creation, man's state of innocency and apostasy, with its consequences. Under the *third*, he considered the doctrines concerning the grace of God, the merits of Christ, his person and offices, faith, and justification, the word of God, the sacraments, conversion, good works, &c. *Tr.*]

can there be any doubt that, from this time onward, theology acquired a more noble and agreeable aspect. Polemic theology experienced much the same fortunes as dogmatic. For it was, for the most part, destitute of all elegance and perspicuity, so long as *Aristotle* had dominion in the theological schools: but after his banishment it gradually received some degree of light and polish. Yet we must acknowledge, with regret, that the common faults of disputants were not effaced even after those times. For if we turn over the pages of the earlier or the later religious controversialists of this century, we find few whom we can truly pronounce desirous of nothing but the advancement of truth, or not deceived and led away by their passions.

§ 19. Our theologians were tardy in cultivating moral theology. Nor, if we except a few eminent men, such as *John Arndt* and *John Gerhard*, and others who treated in a popular way upon the conformation of the soul to the true and internal worship of God, and upon the duties of men, was there a single excellent and accurate writer on the science of morals in all the first part of the century. And hence those who laboured to elucidate what are called *cases of conscience*, were held in estimation. Still, this is a class that could not help falling very often into mistakes, inasmuch as the first and fundamental principles of morals were not yet accurately laid down. *George Calixtus*, whose merits are so great in regard to all other branches of theology, first separated the science of morals from that of dogmatics, and gave it the form of an independent science. He was not indeed allowed to complete the design which all admired in its commencement; but his disciples made use, with good success, of the materials which they got from him, to construct a proper system of moral theology. Scarcely anything was more injurious to their labours, in process of time, than the Peripatetic dress, with which *Calixtus* chose to invest also this part of divine truth. Hence the moderns have torn off this dress, and calling in the aid of the law of nature, which *Puffendorf* and others had purified and illustrated, and collating it carefully with the sacred Scriptures, have not only more clearly laid open the sources of Christian duties, and more correctly ascertained the import of the divine laws, but have also digested and arranged this whole science in a much better manner.

§ 20. During this whole century the Lutheran church was greatly agitated; partly by controversies among the principal doctors, to the great injury of the whole community; and partly by the extravagant zeal and plans of certain persons who disseminated new and strange opinions, uttered prophecies, and attempted to change all our doctrines and institutions. The controversies, which drew the doctors into parties, may be fitly divided into the greater and the less; the former such as disturbed the whole church, and the latter such as disquieted only some part of it. Of the first kind there were two, which occupied the greatest part of the century; the *Syncretistic*, which, from the place whence it arose, was called the *Helmstadian* controversy, and, from the man chiefly concerned in it, the *Calixtine* controversy;

and the *Pietistic*, which some call the *Hallensian* controversy, from the university with which it was waged. Both were occasioned by principles, than which nothing is more holy and lovely: the former, by the love of peace and Christian forbearance, so highly commended by our Saviour; and the latter, by the desire of restoring and advancing fallen piety, which every good man admits should be among the first cares of a Christian teacher. Against these two great virtues, *zeal* for maintaining the truth and for preserving it from all mixture of error, which is likewise an excellent and very useful virtue, engaged in open war. For so critical and hazardous is the condition of human nature, that wars and pests may flow from the very best of sources, if they be acted upon by the turbid movements of men's minds.

§ 21. *George Calixtus*, of Sleswick, a theologian who had few equals in this century, either for learning or for genius, while teaching in that university, which, from its first establishment, granted proper liberty of thought to its professors, early intimated that, in his view, there were some defects in the common opinions of theologians. Afterwards he went further, and showed in various ways that he had a strong desire, not so much to establish peace and harmony among disagreeing Christians as to diminish their anger and implacable *hatred* to each other. Nor did his colleagues differ much from him in this matter: which will the less surprise those who know that such as are created doctors of theology in the university of Helmstadt, are accustomed, all of them, to make oath that they will endeavour, according to their ability, to reconcile and settle the controversies among Christians. The first avowed attack upon them was made in 1639 by *Statius Buscher*, a minister of St. Giles' church in Hanover, an indiscreet man, of the Ramist school, and hostile to [the prevailing] philosophy; who was much displeased because *Calixtus* and his associates preferred the Peripatetic philosophy to that of the sect which he had embraced. The attack was made in a very malignant book, entitled *Crypto-Papismus Novæ Theologiæ Helmstadiensis*;¹ in which he accused *Calixtus* especially of numerous errors. Though *Buscher* made some impression on the minds of individuals, he would perhaps have incurred the reproach of being a rash and unjust accuser, if he had only induced *Calixtus* to be more cautious. But the latter, possessing a generous spirit that disdained all dissimulation, not only persevered, with his colleague, *Conrad Horneius*, in confidently asserting and defending the things which *Buscher* had brought many to regard as novelties and dangerous; but likewise, in the conference at Thorn, in 1645, he incurred the indignation and enmity of the Saxon divines, who were there present. *Frederic William*, elector of Brandenburg, had made him colleague and assistant to the divines whom he sent from Königsberg to that conference: and the Saxon deputies thought it horrible, that a Lutheran divine should afford any aid to the Reformed. This first cause of

¹ [i. e. The disguised popery of the new theology at Helmstadt. Tr.]

offence in that conference was followed by others, which occasioned the Saxons to accuse *Calixtus* of being too friendly to the Reformed. The story is too long to be fully stated here. But after the conference broke up, the Saxon divines, *John Hülsemann*, *James Weller*, *John Scharf*, *Abraham Calovius*, and others, attacked *Calixtus* in their public writings, maintaining, that he had apostatised from the Lutheran doctrines to the sentiments of the Reformed and the papists. These their attacks he repelled, with great vigour and uncommon erudition, being profoundly versed in philosophy and all antiquity, until the year 1656, when he passed from these scenes of discord to heavenly rest.¹

¹ Whoever wishes to know merely the series of events in this controversy, the titles of the books published, the doctrines that were controverted, and similar things, may find writers enough to consult; such as *Walch*, *Introduction to the Controversies in our Church* (in German), *Andr. Charles Weismann* [*Hist. Eccles. sæcul. xvii. p. 1194*], *Arnold* [*Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*, pt. ii. book xvii. ch. xi. § 1, &c.], and many others; but especially *Jo. Möller's Cimbria Litterata*, iii. 121, where he treats largely of the life, fortunes, and writings of *Calixtus*. But whoever wishes to understand the internal character of this controversy, the causes of the several events, the characters of the disputants, the arguments on both sides, in short, the things that are of the highest importance in the controversy, will find no writer to whose fidelity he can safely trust. This history requires a man of ingenuousness, of extensive knowledge of the world, well furnished with documents, which are in a great measure not yet published, and also not a novice in court policy. And I am not certain whether, even in this age, if a man could be found competent to do it, all that is important to the history of this controversy, could be published to the world, without exciting odium, and producing harm. [Schlegel gives the following as the more freely expressed judgment of *Mosheim*, given in his Lectures.—*Calixtus*, by his travels, became acquainted with people of various creeds, and particularly with Roman catholics and the Reformed; and by this intercourse, he acquired a kind of moderation in his judgments respecting persons of other denominations. In particular, he had resided long in England, and contracted an intimacy with several bishops. Here he imbibed the fundamental principles of the English reformation, and his partiality for the ancient churches. And hence he assumed the consent of the church in the five first centuries, as a second source of a true knowledge of a Christian faith, and was of opinion that we had gone too far in the reformation, and that we

should have done better, if we had regulated the church according to the pattern of the early churches. From this source, afterwards, followed all his peculiarities of sentiment. Hence his attachment to ecclesiastical antiquity; hence his desire for the union of all classes of Christians; hence his inclination towards the Roman church; which cannot be denied, though he acknowledged and exposed numerous faults and abuses in that church. And hence, also, it arose, that he had a particular respect for the English church, as retaining more of the usages of the ancient church: and that many of his pupils went over, some to the Roman and others to the English church. *Calixtus* became renowned in early life. A young lord of *Klenck* had been prepossessed in favour of the catholic religion by the Jesuit, *Augustine Turrianus* of *Hildesheim*. The mother, wishing to prevent his apostasy, invited *Cornelius Martini*, a professor at *Helmstadt*, and the strongest metaphysician of his age, to come to her castle at *Hildesheim* and dispute with the Jesuit, in the presence of her son. *Martini* denied himself this honour, and recommended to his pupil, the young *Calixtus*. He, on the first day, drove the Jesuit into such straits that he could say nothing: and the next morning he secretly decamped. The history of this transaction may be found in the *Summa Colloquii Hemelschenburgensis*. This remarkable victory led the duke of Brunswick to raise him from a master in philosophy to the rank of professor in theology. While only a master, he had published 15 *Disputationes de Præcipuis Religionis Christianæ capitibus*; in which he intimated pretty clearly, that he did not believe all that was generally believed in our church; and particularly, he explained the doctrine of the transfer of attributes (*Communicatio Idiomatum*) differently from the common explanation. Likewise to his *Epitome Theologie*, published in 1619, *Balthasar Mentzer* of *Giessen*, and *Henry Höpfer* of *Leipsic*, made many exceptions. For he mixed his scholastic philosophy with theo-

§ 22. After the death of *Calixtus*, and the decease also of those by whom he had been most opposed, the flames of this war raged far

logy; and taught, among other things, that God was the accidental cause of sin,—a proposition, which was liable to be very ill interpreted, and which he afterwards recalled, on account of its liability to misinterpretation. Thus he was involved in contentions from the commencement of his professorship; and they were increased in 1634, when he published the first part of his *Epitome Theologiæ Moralis*, and subjoined to it a Digression, *de Nova Arte*, in opposition to Barthold Nihusen. In particular, the Ramists were his mortal enemies, because he was an Aristotelian. One of these, Statius Buscher (who had read lectures at Helmstadt as a master, before Calixtus did), being prompted to it by some enemies of Calixtus, published his *Crypto-Papismus Novæ Theologiæ Helmstadiensis*; to which Calixtus and Horneius made answer. The honest Buscher was summoned before the Consistory: but he chose not to appear personally, and therefore defended himself in writing. He gave up his office, retired to Stade, where he died of grief, in 1641. Thus this contest faded away. Buscher's accusations were ill founded; and his patrons were afraid to expose themselves. But four years after, a very different conflict arose, which lasted as long as Calixtus lived. The king of Poland, Uladislas IV., appointed the Charitable Conference (*Colloquium Charitativum*), at Thorn: in which all religious parties were to appear, and confer together on religion, and come to agreement. To this conference, on the side of the Lutherans, some Saxon divines of Wittenberg especially, were invited from Germany; for they were regarded as standing at the head of all the German theologians. The great elector of Brandenburg, prince Frederic William, invited Calixtus from Brunswick to accompany and assist the Königsberg divines; and Calixtus not only complied, but also committed the error of going previously to Berlin, and hence travelling in company with the Reformed divines to Thorn, lodging in the same house, eating at the same table, and in general having the greatest familiarity with them. As the Königsberg divines had not yet arrived, and so Calixtus had nothing to do in the Conference, the magistrates of Elbing and Thorn invited him to assist them; which he engaged to do. But the Saxon and Dantzic divines (among the latter of whom Calovius was the most violent) threw in their remonstrance; alleging, that he could not be admitted as a speaker in behalf of the divines of these cities, because he belonged to a university which

did not embrace the *Formula of Concord*, and because he had rendered himself suspected, by his intimacy with the Reformed. This remonstrance induced the senate of Elbing to desist from the measure. As Calixtus could not in this way be brought to take an active part, another occurrence afforded him something to do. The Polish Reformed and the Bohemian Brethren, when they saw that the Dantzic divines would not tolerate him among the Lutheran speakers, invited him to be *their* speaker; which he consented to, yet with the restriction, that he should hold with them only in the points on which protestants were at issue with the catholics. He afterwards printed some notes on the Creed, which were laid before the Conference; in which he made it appear, that he did not, in all points, agree with the Reformed. But all this was insufficient to quiet the suspicion against him. The rumour spread everywhere, that Calixtus was an apostate. The disaffection towards him was increased as the Polish Roman catholic lords of Thorn treated him with more attention than they did the other divines, and associated more frequently with him. If Calixtus had possessed more prudence and foresight, and his opponents more candour and justice, things would not have come to such a pass. While these events were going on, the Königsberg divines arrived. But now a contest arose between them and the divines of Dantzic, respecting precedence. The former claimed precedence, as being envoys of the great electoral prince; and the latter, because they previously arrived, and had taken their seats. In such contests, the whole three months allotted to the Conference passed away; and the deputies returned home, having accomplished nothing. The contest with Calixtus now became warm. The Saxon divines were obliged to justify their conduct towards him at the Conference; and they found it necessary to charge him with being a corruptor of religion, a concealed Calvinist, and a wicked heretic. Calixtus himself gave occasion for increasing the strife, by a disputation on the mystery of the Trinity, which Dr. Jo. Latermann wrote and defended, under him, in 1645: in which it was maintained, that the doctrine of the Trinity was not made known to the fathers under the Old Testament, and that it was a created angel, and not the Son of God, who appeared to the patriarchs. On this point he was assailed, although he had so explained himself, as ought to have given satisfaction. Our whole church was, by this contest, wrought into a

worse than before. The Saxons continued, and especially *Calovius*, most bitterly to insult the dead lion; nay, imprudently proceeded to pave the way (as many of the best men, who were by no means Calixtines, believed) for an open schism in the Lutheran church. For a new book was drawn up, entitled *Renewed Consent to the Faith truly Lutheran*,¹ which was to be added to those books called by us *Symbolical*, and to receive the confirmation of an oath from all public teachers; by which *Calixtus*, with his followers and friends, was pronounced unworthy of the Lutheran community, and therefore also of the benefits of the peace granted to the Lutherans. The memory or reputation of *Calixtus* was modestly defended by *Gerhard Titius*, *Joachim Hildebrand*, and other theologians of a temperate character. And the most discerning men demonstrated, that the book called *Consensus*, &c., would be a firebrand, the cause of perpetual dissension, and ruinous to the Lutheran cause; and, by their efforts, it was prevented from ever obtaining the least authority. It was opposed, besides others of less note, by *Frederic Ulric Calixtus*, the son of *George*, a man not unlearned, yet much inferior to his father in genius, polish, and erudition. In favour of the *Consensus*, appeared and fought, especially, *Abraham Calovius* and *Ægidius Strauchius*. An immense number of books and disputes was produced by the zeal of the two parties, in which, alas! are so many invectives, reproaches, and gross personalities, as to make it manifest, that the disputants contended less for the cause of truth and of Christ Jesus, than for personal glory and revenge. After long-continued altercation, the enfeebled age of those who led the two parties, the abolition of the *Consensus repetitus* (which would have afforded aliment for ruinous war), the rise of new controversies among us, with some other causes, near the end of the century, silently put an end to the contest.

§ 23. The principal of all the charges so odiously alleged against *Calixtus*, was his zeal for bringing those three more eminent families of European Christians, the Popish, the Lutheran, and the Reformed, not to *unite* together, or to form themselves into a *single body*, as his enemies made him mean, but to abstain from their mutual hatred

flame, which it was difficult to extinguish. Solomon Glassius, by order of Ernest, duke of Gotha, published his *Thoughts*; which aimed to restore peace, and in many points did justice to *Calixtus*. But the effort was fruitless. Duke Ernest went further; he wrote to the electoral court of Saxony, and to the court of Brunswick, and urged them to lend aid to allay these angry disputes. But the minds of men were so embittered, that they could not think of peace. At length, as the Saxon divines, and particularly *Calovius* (who had previously been invited to Wittemberg), urged the setting forth a new symbolical book, the princes of electoral Saxony so vividly depicted the mischiefs which would thence result to our church, that, in view of these representa-

tions, the proposed introduction of what was called the *Consensus repetitus*, was laid aside. Yet the conflicts went on, and were conducted with so much bitterness and acrimony, that one party commenced an action against the other for abuse; and *Calovius* wrote his bitter *Historia Syncretistica*, which was confiscated by the elector of Saxony. Finally, as the Pietistic contest commenced soon after this, the Calixtine contest was dropped. For the Wittembergers engaged in a new controversy with *Spener*, and as they were afraid that the Calixtines would all join with *Spener*, they made a compromise with the divines of Helmstadt. *Schl.*]

¹ *Consensus repetitus Fidei vere Lutheranae.*

and *enmity*, and to cultivate mutually love and good-will. And this it was, that was generally condemned under the name of *Syncretism*.¹ The opinions which, in addition to this purpose, were charged upon him as faults, respected the less clear knowledge of the doctrine of the Trinity, in the times of the Old Testament; the necessity of good works to salvation; God's being, *accidentally*, the cause of sin; the visible appearances of the Son of God under the ancient dispensation; and some few others; which were such, that if he really held them, they were of no great consequence, according to the acknowledgment of those whom no one will pronounce unfit judges of such questions; and did not vitiate the marrow (so to speak) of divine truth. But in order to recommend that harmony among disagreeing Christians, which he had in view, this excellent man was under the necessity of assuming two things, that were thought even worse than the plan which induced him to bring them forward. The first was, that the groundwork of Christianity, or those first and elementary principles, from which all the other truths flow, remained sound and uncontaminated, in all the three families of Christians. This groundwork, he supposed, was contained in that ancient formula, called the *Apostles'*

¹ I do not espouse the cause of Calixtus; nor maintain, that all he wrote and taught was faultless: but the love of truth admonishes me to say, that this excellent man fell into the hands of bad interpreters; and that even these, who thought they understood his meaning better than others, erred egregiously. He is commonly represented as advising to a *union* with the Roman pontiff and his adherents; but entirely without grounds. For he declared publicly, that with the Roman church, such as it now is, we cannot possibly associate and be in harmony; and that if formerly there was any hope of healing the breach, that hope was wholly extinguished and annihilated, by the denunciations of the council of Trent. He is said, also, to have approved, or excused, all the errors and superstitions which deform the Roman church, or at least very many of them. But here, not only the numerous writings, in which he refutes the doctrines and opinions of the papists, but also the papists themselves, clear him of fault; for they acknowledge that Calixtus assailed their church more learnedly and ingeniously, than all the other protestant doctors. Instead of all, hear Jac. Benignus Bossuet, in his *Traité de la Communion sous les Deux Espèces*, pt. i. § 2, p. 12, who writes thus of him: 'Le fameux Georges Calixte, le plus habile des Luthériens de notre tems, qui a écrit le plus doctement contre nous.' Calixtus taught, indeed, that as to the *foundation* of the faith, there was no dissension between us and the papists: and I wish he had omitted this altogether, or had expressed it in more fit and suitable

terms. But he most constantly maintained, that upon the foundation of religion, the pontiffs and their adherents had based very many things, which no wise and good man should receive. And how much this should deduct from the odium and turpitude of that opinion, is manifest. I omit other aspersions of the memory of this great man, by those who think they ought to listen rather to his accusers than to the accused. What then, you will say, did he mean?—*First*, this: that if it could be, that the Roman church should be recovered to the state, in which it was in the first five centuries after Christ, the protestants could then have no just grounds for refusing communion with it: and *secondly*, this: that among the adherents to the Roman pontiff, though as a body they were polluted with many and intolerable errors, those individuals should not be excluded from all hope of salvation, nor be ranked with heretics, who honestly have imbibed what their fathers and their teachers have taught them, and who are prevented from seeing the truth, either in consequence of their ignorance, or their education, or, lastly, by their early prepossessions; provided they believe with simplicity whatever is contained in the *Apostles' Creed*, and study to conform their lives to the precepts of Christ. As I have already said, I do not stand forth as the patron of these opinions: they have patrons enough, at the present day: but this, I suppose, all will concede, that these views are much more tolerable than those with which he is commonly charged.

Creed. The second assumption was, that whatever is supported by the constant and uniform consent and authority of the ancient Christian fathers, who were ornaments to the first five centuries, must be regarded as no less true and certain than those things which we find recorded in the holy Scriptures. The *first* of these was the pillar that sustained the whole project he had in view; the *second* was of use to excuse certain papal institutions and opinions which were very disagreeable to Lutherans, and to establish harmony among disagreeing Christians.

§ 24. In these commotions and contests were involved, though in a different way, the divines of Rinteln, Königsberg, and Jena: to say nothing of some others. The divines of Rinteln, especially *John Henrichius* and *Peter Musæus*, by many things, but most clearly in the conference at Cassel already mentioned, gave evidence that they approved of the plan of *Calixtus* for terminating the contests among Christians, and especially among protestants. And *they* too were attacked, in various publications, by the Saxon divines, and such as took sides with them.¹ At Königsberg, *Christ. Dreyer*, a very learned man, and *John Laternmann*, both pupils of *Calixtus*, with *Michael Behn*, signified pretty clearly that they favoured the opinions of their instructor. Against them hostility was declared, not only by their colleagues, *John Behn* and *Celestine Mislenta*, but likewise by the whole body of ministers at Königsberg. And the contest was protracted many years in such a manner as brought honour to neither party in the view of posterity. This intestine war being extinguished, partly by the authority of the civil power, and partly by the death of *Behn* and *Mislenta*, *Dreyer* and his associates had to sustain another and a permanent one, with those foreign divines, who viewed the Calixtine opinions as pernicious, and the defenders of them as enemies to the church; nor can this foreign contest likewise be commended, either for its equity or its moderation.²

§ 25. In these commotions the divines of Jena manifested uncommon prudence and moderation. For while they ingenuously confessed that all the opinions of *Calixtus* could scarcely be tolerated, and could not be admitted entirely, without injury to the truth, they judged that most of his doctrines were not so very bad as the Saxons thought them; and that several of them might be tolerated without the least hazard. *Solomon Glassius*, a man of great mildness, by order of *Ernest the Pious*, duke of Saxe-Gotha, most equitably examined the importance of the several controverted points in a work expressly on the subject.³ *John Musæus*, a man of superior learning and uncommon acuteness, first determined, that it was allowable to

¹ See Abrah. Calovius, *Hist. Syncretistica*, p. 618, &c. J. G. Walch, *Introduction to the contests in the Lutheran church* [in German], i. 286, &c.

² Christopher Hartknoch's *Pruessische Kirchenhistorie*, book ii. ch. x. p. 602, &c. and others. Möller's *Cimbria Litterata*, iii. 150, &c. The Acts and Documents are in

the *Unschuld. Nachr.* A.D. 1740, p. 144, A.D. 1742, p. 29, A.D. 1745, p. 91, and elsewhere.

³ This judgment, drawn up in German, was first published, after the death of *Glassius*, in 1662; and again, a few years ago, at Jena, in 8vo. It is an example of theological moderation, and most worthy of an attentive perusal.

say, with *Calixtus* and *Hoerneius*, that, in a certain sense, good works are necessary to salvation; afterwards he maintained among his intimate friends, that little or no importance was attached to some of the other questions. These, therefore, the Calixtine divines would not, perhaps, have refused as arbiters. But this moderation was so offensive to the Saxon divines, that they arraigned the school of Jena as lying under suspicion of many errors, and declared, that *John Musæus*, in particular, had departed in not a few things from the sound faith.¹

§ 26. These contests were succeeded, and extinguished, by what are called the *Pietistic* controversies. These originated from those who undertook, undoubtedly with the best intentions, to aid the cause of languishing piety, and to cure the faults both of the public teachers and of the multitude. But, as often happens, these controversies were multiplied and aggravated by various sorts of persons, whose ill-informed understandings, or heated imaginations, or some wrong bias of mind, led them to excite horrible commotions in one place and another, by their singular opinions, their pretended visions, their harsh and unintelligible rules for Christian conduct, and their very imprudent clamours about a total change of the form and institutions of the church. The slumbering Christians, and also such as bemoaned in secret the progress of irreligion, were first aroused by *Philip James Spener*, an excellent minister, and very highly esteemed both for his great piety and his extensive learning; when he set up private meetings at Frankfort, for the purpose of exhorting and training the people to piety, and afterwards set forth, in a special treatise, his *Pious Desires*,² that is, his views of the evils existing in our church, and their remedies. Both met the approbation of very many, who had good and upright dispositions. But as many of them did not apply these remedies for diseased souls with sufficient caution and skill, and as those religious meetings (or *Colleges of Piety*, as they were denominated in terms borrowed from the Dutch) enkindled in the minds of the multitude, in several places, a wild and enthusiastic spirit, rather than a true love to God, complaints were soon heard from various quarters, that, under pretence of aiding and advancing piety, solid religious knowledge was neglected, and torches found for setting contentious and ill-balanced minds on fire.³

¹ With what faults the theologians of Jena, and especially Musæus, were charged, may be best learned from the grave and solid work of Musæus himself, entitled, *Der Jenischen Theologen ausführliche Erklärung über drey und neunzig vermeynte Religions-fragen*, Jena, 1677 and 1704, 4to. Add Jo. Geo. Walch's *Introduction to the Controversies in the Lutheran church* [in German], i. 405, &c.

² *Pia Desideria*.

³ [On these controversies, it is proper to go back to the first causes. The long thirty years' war produced, throughout the whole

Lutheran church, very great prostration of order, neglect of discipline, and profligacy: and the preachers were incompetent to meet this disordered state of things, which continued to exist after the return of peace. Some preachers were wholly incompetent to it: for the people had to choose such preachers as they could get; and among these, many were of different talents and acquisitions. Others had no lack of native talent; but they had been ill instructed. For education was very differently conducted in the higher schools then from what it is now. The chief science then taught,

§ 27. These first commotions would, undoubtedly, have gradually subsided, if still more violent ones had not supervened in 1689, at

was the dry and cloudy Aristotelian metaphysics; with which were connected scholastic dogmatics and polemics. Thus our theology was very dark and intricate, and such as was unfit for the pulpit and for common life: the heads of the preachers were full of technical terms and distinctions; and no one understood how to make the truths of Christianity intelligible to the common people. Besides, systematic and polemic theology were pursued; but moral theology, and biblical interpretation, were almost wholly laid aside. Of course the preaching was very poor, as is manifest from the postills of those times. The clergy preached from the lectures in the schools; and, therefore, explained and proved the doctrines of faith artificially, which the people could not understand; or they ornamented their sermons with quotations from the fathers and from the heathen philosophers. They confuted errors and heresies, the very names of which, frequently, were unknown to their hearers, but said little or nothing that was calculated to amend the hearts of their hearers; and they could say the less on such subjects, as they themselves, often, possessed unsanctified minds, hearts in which pride, contentiousness, obstinacy, and a persecuting spirit predominated. Other clergymen, who were competent to instruct the people in true godliness, had not power to correct the disorders that had broken in; because the bad habits had become too deeply rooted, and the evil too inveterate. Hence there were in our church various devout and upright persons, who sighed over this state of the church; and who wished to see godliness more cultivated, and the mode of teaching, both in the schools and from the pulpit, reformed. Among these persons, the first and the most famous was Spener. He must be ranked among the most learned and the most devout ministers of our church; and together with most of the branches of theological science, he was well versed in history, and the auxiliary sciences; and had, successively, as a preacher at Strasburg, an elder at Frankfort, and first court preacher at Dresden, obtained, in all these offices, the reputation of a discreet, modest, and peaceable theologian. At Dresden he fell under the displeasure of the elector John George IV., who was much addicted to drunkenness, and to whom Spener, who was his confessor, as he was going to confession, addressed a very respectful letter, containing an earnest dissuasive from his bad habit. Spener now went to Berlin; and his migrations spread

wider the Pietistic controversy. If any things are censurable in Spener, they are principally two things. *First*, he was not much of a philosopher, at least theoretically; and it is not much to be wondered at, that he should have little relish for the dry philosophy of those times. Besides, if he had possessed a taste for it, he would not have accomplished what he *did* accomplish. Still, this deficiency led him, sometimes, to reason inconclusively, and also not to see clearly the consequences of his propositions. *Secondly*, he was by nature too compliant and yielding. He could not say a hard thing to any man; and when he saw in a person any marks of piety, he at once recognised him as a brother, although he might hold erroneous doctrines. And this caused him much trouble, and led him to be often deceived by hypocrites. This was manifestly a consequence of his good-natured character, which judged other men by himself; yet it in some measure obscured the greatness of his talents. Still, this weakness will hinder no impartial man from acknowledging that Spener was really a great man; to whom we stand indebted for the improvement of our mode of preaching, for more freedom in the manner of handling theological subjects, for the introduction of toleration towards other religious sects, and towards individuals who deviate from the common creed, and for the advancement of true godliness in our church. This last object he endeavoured to effect, especially by his *Colleges of Piety*; which he set up by the advice of some friends at Frankfort, in 1670, first in his own house, and afterwards also in the church; partly to produce more cordial friendship among those who were seeking to edify their souls; and partly to render the public preaching of God's word more profitable, by explaining the sermons delivered, by catechising, by lectures on the holy Scriptures, with prayer and singing. The appellation, *Colleges of Piety*, was derived from Holland, where there is a party, who, from their meetings for worship, which they call *Collegia*, are denominated *Collegiants*. (See below, chap. vii. § 1.) From them the name was derived, though Spener's meetings had no resemblance to the institution of the Dutch Collegiants. To the establishment of these meetings, must be added a circumstance, which caused Spener much trouble. When Arndt's *Postills* were to be republished in 1675, Spener composed a long preface to them; in which, together with his favourite doctrines of better times to come, the previous general conversion of

Leipsic. Certain pious and learned men, especially *Augustus Herman Franck*, *John Caspar Schuele*, and *Paul Antony*, who were disciples and friends of *Spener*, then sustaining the office of first preacher at the Saxon court, and who were teachers of philosophy, thought that candidates for the sacred office might be, and ought to be, better trained for their employment, than the practice of the universities allowed; and therefore they undertook themselves to expound certain books of the holy Bible, in such a manner as at the same time to infuse a spirit of solid piety into the minds of their hearers. This new and singular course allured a great number to their lectures: many of whom exhibited the benefits which they derived from these recitations in lives and conduct very remote from the vicious habits of that age. Whether this first fervour of both the teachers and the learners, laudable and excellent in itself, was always kept within due bounds, it is not easy for any one to say: but this is certain, many, and they men of great authority, maintain that it was not; and public fame reports, that some things were brought forward and transacted in those *Biblical Colleges*, as they were called, which were in themselves indeed easy to be excused and borne with, if referred to moderate and candid judges, yet not a little at variance with common usage and the laws of prudence. When great tumult arose, and the matter was brought to a judicial investigation, the learned men above named were pronounced innocent, or not guilty of the errors alleged against them; yet they were ordered to desist from the labours which they had commenced. In these commotions the invidious name of

the Jews, and the great downfall of popery, he also described the defects in our church, and proposed some means for their remedy. Among these were an improved mode of teaching in the higher schools, the better instruction of youth, the dispensing with metaphysics, and a zealous application to biblical interpretation and practical theology. This preface was afterwards printed separately, in 1678, and entitled *Pia Desideria*. [The whole title of the book, which was written in German, was, *Pia Desideria, or Earnest Desires for the godly improvement of the true Evangelical Church, with some Christian proposals for that object. Tr.*] It was well received by the majority, and was praised even by some who afterwards became his enemies. But after a while, propositions were drawn from it, which were charged upon him as errors. The first attack was made by *Dilfeld*, a deacon at *Nordhausen*, who assailed the position, that a true theologian must be a regenerate man. Greater disturbances arose from the meetings. Many imitated them; but they did not possess *Spener's* prudence. In some, there was no preacher to regulate the meeting; and there, all sorts of irregularity took place. In others, every one was allowed to speak; and of course speeches

were often made, which contravened the standard evangelical doctrines, and ran into enthusiasm; and now visionaries and enthusiasts actually connected themselves with the followers of *Spener*. In small villages, they went on tolerably well; but in larger places, as *Hamburg* for example, there were frequent commotions. And there in particular, *Jo. Fred. Mayer*, a *Hamburg* doctor, distinguished himself in a very offensive manner by his carnal zeal against *Spener's* brother-in-law, *Jo. Henry Horbius*. See *Köhler's Hist. Münzbelustigungen*, xvii. 363, &c. At *Erfurt*, *Dantzic*, *Wolfenbüttel*, *Gotha*, and even at *Halle*, in *Saxony*, there were great commotions, which the magistrates had to still. *Spener* himself, when he saw the disorders that arose from these meetings, suppressed those he had set up. Others followed his example. But in many places, the people would not give them up: while yet they did not exercise sufficient prudence. The people frequently began to forsake the public worship, and to run only to the meetings: and the blame was cast upon *Spener*; who was entirely innocent in this matter, and who, by his preaching and his publications, explicitly opposed this wrong conduct. *Schl.*]

Pietists was first heard of, or at least first publicly used. Some light-minded people first imposed it on those who attended these *Biblical Colleges*, and whose lives accorded with the precepts there inculcated: afterwards it was extended to all such as were supposed either to profess too rigid and austere principles of morals, or, neglecting the truth, to refer all religion to mere piety. But, as is apt to be the fortune of names which designate particular sects, this name was not unfrequently applied, in familiar discourse, to the very best of men, and to those who were as careful to advance truth as piety; and, on the other hand, it was very often applied to persons who might more correctly be denominated flagitious, delirious, and fanatical.¹

¹ [When Spener was called from Frankfurt to Dresden, he had constantly with him a number of theological students, some of whom lodged in his house, and others boarded at his table, and whom he instructed how to discharge profitably the duties of preachers. Some of these went to Leipsic, to teach theology there, in accordance with Spener's prescriptions. Among these were Aug. Herm. Franck and Paul Antony, both afterwards professors at Halle, Jo. Casp. Schade, afterwards a famous preacher at Berlin, and Herm. van der Hardt, afterwards professor at Helmstadt. These commenced the biblical lectures. In these there was something new; for the lectures were given in German, Luther's translation was here and there amended, and the explanation of the holy Scriptures was followed by religious exhortations. Concerning these biblical lectures, especially as the religious lectures of some of the professors were now more thinly attended, all sorts of rumours soon spread abroad, some of which were groundless, and others perhaps had some foundation. It was said, that not only students, but also labouring men and women, were admitted to them; and that every one present was allowed to teach and explain the Scriptures. Those who attended these lectures changed their manners and their dress, refrained from the customary amusements, and obtained the name of *Pietists* (to which a severe funeral discourse of Dr. Carpov, at the interment of a hearer of Mr. Franck, and the funeral ode of Lic. Feller, on the same occasion, wherein the import of the word, and the characteristics of a *Pietist*, were explained, are supposed principally to have contributed). In 1689, the court of Dresden appointed a commission to investigate this affair; but the accused masters (especially Franck) obtained the famous Christ. Thomasius for their counsellor; who well defended them, in a published judicial argument, and showed palpably the nullity of the criminal process commenced against

them; and they were acquitted of all criminality: though, at the same time, their biblical lectures were prohibited. But the thing shot like lightning from Leipsic through the whole church. All who loved holiness must have also such *Collegia* [or lectures: for the Germans use the words *collegia* in Latin, and *collegien* in German, both for the lectures of professors in a university, and for associate *bodies of learned men*: so that *Collegia Biblica* may here be best translated *Biblical Lectures*. *Tr.*] Thus the learned and the unlearned held meetings which were called seasons for prayer and for devotion. Into these meetings, fantastical persons and enthusiasts insinuated themselves, and talked of the millennial kingdom, and the downfall of Babylon; railed against the clergy, and brought forward prophecies, and dreams, and visions. Hence there arose, in almost all places, *Pietistic* commotions; which the magistrates endeavoured to still by severe laws. During these transactions, Spener was called from Dresden to Berlin; and Thomasius, of whom the Leipsic divines complained as being a heretic and a teacher of error, was obliged to flee to Halle. He it was who projected the establishment of the university of Halle; and Spener supported him. The university was established; and the very masters, who had held the biblical lectures at Leipsic, were, in part, appointed the professors of theology in this new university. These commenced reading, according to Spener's views; and abolished the old scholastic method of teaching. They spoke disparagingly of philosophy; and said that polemics made the people too disputatious; that the greatest *heretic* was the *old Adam*; and that *he* especially must be combated. In place of polemic theology, they recommended mystic: and nearly all the mystical writings of the French and Italians were translated and printed at the Orphan House in Halle. Persons who, on account of their peculiar opinions, were not tolerated in other places, were received and

§ 28. From Leipsic this controversy spread, with incredible rapidity, throughout Lutheran Germany, nay, through our whole church. For from this time onward, everywhere, in cities, villages, and hamlets, people suddenly started up, of all orders and classes, learned and illiterate, males and females; who pretended to be called by some divine impulse to eradicate wickedness, to encourage and to propagate neglected piety, to regulate and govern the Church of Christ more wisely; and who showed, partly by oral declarations, partly by their writings, and partly by their institutions, what must be done in order to effect the great object. Nearly all who were animated with this zeal agreed that there was no more powerful and salutary means for imbuing the people with a thorough knowledge of divine things, and with a love of holiness, than those private discussions and conventicles, which they understood were first instituted by *Spener*, and afterwards held at Leipsic. Meetings, therefore, of this kind, but of a different character, some better and others worse regulated, were opened in numerous places. These unusual and unexpected movements gave the more trouble and perplexity to those who had the oversight of the church and the state, because upright and well-meaning persons who took part in these meetings, were joined by a number of mistaken and rash characters, whose cry was, that Babylon (so they chose to call the Lutheran church) was nodding to its fall. These men, besides, alarmed and stirred up the fickle populace by feigning visions and heavenly incitements; they arrogated to themselves the authority of prophets of God, and not only obscured religious subjects by a gloomy jargon, of I know not whose coinage, but also recalled upon the stage opinions long since condemned; asserted, that the reign of a thousand years, mentioned by St. John, was at hand; in short, they were bent upon unsettling everything that had been ordered best, and they claimed for all men promiscuously a right to act as teachers. Thus the Lutheran church was miserably rent into parties, to the joy of the papists; the most violent contests everywhere arose; and those who disagreed, more perhaps in terms, and in external and indifferent things, than on doctrines of high moment, were arrayed against each other; and, finally, in most provinces, severe laws were enacted against those who were denominated *Pietists*.¹

provided for at Halle. While these things were going forward, the divines of Wittemberg (for we pass over the attack of the Leipsic divines), in 1695, brought a formal accusation against *Spener*, as a teacher of error: and against this attack *Spener* defended himself energetically. It is certain that the court of Dresden, in whose eye the university of Halle was a thorn, looked upon this attack with pleasure. From this time onward, our divines were divided into the orthodox and the *Spenerian*. The theologians of Halle joined the party of their teachers; and thence arose a dissimilitude, which scarcely has a parallel. *Schl.*]

¹ For the illustration of these facts, in place of all others, may be consulted, Jo. Geo. Walch, *Introduction to the Controversies in our Church* [in German], vol. ii. and iii. He concisely states the various acts of this tragedy, enumerates the principal disputes, subjoining his own opinion, and everywhere mentions the authorities. A full and complete history hardly any one man could compose, the transactions were so numerous and various. It is therefore to be wished, that some wise, considerate, and impartial men, well acquainted with human nature and civil affairs, and well provided with the necessary documents, would undertake the composition of such a history. If

§ 29. These restorers of piety were of two classes. Some proposed to advance the cause, and yet leave in full force both the creed of the church, as contained in our public formulas, and also its discipline and form of government. But others judged, that holiness could not possibly flourish among us, unless both the received doctrines were modified, and the whole internal organisation and the customs of our church were changed. *Philip James Spener*, who removed from Dresden to Berlin in 1691, is justly considered as standing at the head of the former class. With him agreed, especially, the theologians of the new university at Halle; among whom were *Augustus Herman Franck* and *Paul Antony*, who had previously fallen under suspicion at Leipsic. The object of this class no one much censured; nor could a man censure it, unless he wished to appear a bad man: yet many persons, and especially the theological faculty at Wittemberg, were of opinion, that, in the prosecution of this object, some principles were adopted, and plans formed, which were injurious to the truth and adverse to the interests of the church. And this belief led them publicly to accuse of many false and dangerous opinions, first, *Spener*, in the year 1695, and afterwards his associates and friends who defended the reputation of this great man. The vestiges of these contests are still so recent, that whoever is disposed may easily learn with what degree of good faith, modesty, and equity, they were conducted on both sides.

§ 30. The subject-matter of these controversies was manifold, and therefore cannot be reduced to one grand point, or comprehended under one term. Yet if we consider the aims of those from whom they originated, the principal questions may be brought under certain heads. Those who laboured to advance the cause of piety, in the first place, were of opinion that the most strenuous opponents of their object were the very persons whose office it was to promote piety; namely, the teachers and ministers of the church. Hence they would commence with them; and would make it their special care that none might become pastors of the Christian congregations who were not properly educated, and also sanctified, or full of divine love. For this purpose: I. They recommended the reformation of the theological schools. They would have the systematic theology of the age, which was confined to certain short and nice questions, and wrapped up in unusual phraseology, to be laid aside; the controversies with other sects to be, indeed, not wholly neglected, yet less attended to; and the combination and intermixture of philosophy and human wisdom with the truths of revelation to be wholly abolished. On the contrary, they thought that young men designed for the ministry should be led to read and meditate upon the holy Scriptures; a simple

certain persons were to collect from the public records and from various private papers the transactions in particular districts, and then deliver over the whole to an individual, who should arrange, combine and impart strength and unity to the whole,

the business would thus, perhaps, be accomplished in the best manner it can be. Such a history, written with moderation and discretion, would be exceedingly useful, in very many ways.

knowledge of the Christian religion, derived principally from the sacred volume, should be instilled into them; and that their whole education should be directed more to practical utility and the edification of Christians, and not so much for display and personal glory. As some of them, perhaps, disputed on these subjects without using sufficient precision and prudence, a suspicion arose with many that these patrons of piety despised philosophy and other branches of learning altogether; that they rejected all solid knowledge in theology; that they disapproved of zeal in the defence of the truth against its corruptors; and that they made theological learning to consist in a crude and vague power of declaiming about morals and practical duties. And hence arose the contest respecting the value of philosophy and human science in religion, the dignity and utility of what is called *systematic* theology, the necessity of controversial theology, the value of mystical theology, the best method of instructing the people, and other similar questions. II. They taught, that as much solicitude should be shown, that the future teachers in the churches might consecrate their hearts to God, and be living examples of piety, as that they might carry away from the universities minds well fraught with useful knowledge. From this opinion, to which all good men readily assented, originated not only certain regulations suited to restrain the passions of studious youth, and to awaken in them holy emotions and resolutions, but likewise that doctrine which produced so much controversy, namely: that no one *can* teach others to be pious, and guide them to salvation, unless he is himself pious and a friend of God. Many thought that this doctrine both derogated from the efficacy of God's word, which cannot be frustrated by the imperfections of its ministers, and also led on to the long-exploded errors of the Donatists; especially since it was not stated with equal caution and prudence by all. And here commenced those long and difficult controversies, which are not yet terminated: Whether the knowledge of religion, which a wicked man may acquire, can be called theology? Whether a vicious man can have a true knowledge of religion? How far may the ministrations of an irreligious minister be efficacious and salutary? Whether illumination is ever given to a bad man, whose heart is averse from God? and the like.

§ 31. These restorers of fallen piety, to render the people more obedient to their pious and properly educated teachers, and more resolute in opposing their native depravity, deemed it necessary, I. To suppress, in the public instruction, certain common expressions which the depravity of men leads them not unfrequently to construe in a way to favour their wickedness. Such were the following: that no person can attain, in the present life, that perfection which the law of God demands; that good works are not necessary to salvation; that in the act of justification faith only is concerned, and not also good works. But very many feared that, if these barriers were removed, the truth would be corrupted, or at least would be exposed naked and defenceless to its enemies. II. That stricter rules of conduct should be introduced than were generally followed; and that many things

which foster the internal diseases of the mind, such as dancing, buffoonery, jocular discourse, games, dramatic exhibitions, the reading of amusing books, and certain kinds of pleasures, should be removed from the class of indifferent things, which are either good or bad, according to the spirit and temper of those who engage in them, and should be classed among sinful and unlawful things. But many thought this morality too rigorous. Hence that old controversy of the schools was revived: whether there are certain actions that are neither good nor evil, but indifferent; or whether everything men do is either sinful or holy. And on each of the subjects enumerated there were frequent and very warm debates, which were not always conducted with precision, temperance, and gravity. III. That, in addition to the public assemblies for religious worship, there should be frequent private meetings for prayer and other religious exercises. But very many judged, and experience confirmed the opinion, that these *Colleges of piety*, as they were called, were attended with more danger than profit. The minor contest, respecting certain terms or plans, which did not originate from these sources, need not be mentioned.¹ But it is important to add, that the kindness of those who were so earnest to promote piety, towards certain persons, who were not perhaps bad men, but whose understandings were not well informed and sound, or who were chargeable with no slight errors, exceedingly displeased many of the opposite party, and afforded them no little ground for suspicion, that they set a lower value upon truth and the theology contained in the symbolical books than upon practical holiness. Among so great a multitude of combatants, and they men of various classes and tempers, it is not strange that there should have been many indiscreet persons, some over-zealous, and others leaning towards the opposite faults to those which they wished to avoid.

§ 32. The other class of Pietists, or those who laboured to promote piety in a way that would lead to a change in the established doctrines of the Lutheran community, and to a modification of the whole form and constitution of the church, were men of various characters. Some of them, from want of a due control over their own minds, were not so much holders of erroneous opinions, as men whose reason and judgment were impaired: others combined the fictions, which they either derived from the works of others, or invented themselves, with a certain portion of sounder doctrine. We shall mention only some of the better sort of them, and such as acquired a distinguished reputation.—*Godfrey Arnold*, of Anneberg in Saxony, a man of much reading, of a good understanding, and of natural eloquence, disturbed the close of the century by various writings, but espe-

¹ All these controversies were first collected and arranged, though unduly multiplied, by Sam. Schelwig, in his *Synopsis Controversiarum sub Pietatis prætextu motarum*: first published, Dantzic, 1701, 8vo. But they may be better learned, together

with the arguments of both parties, from Joachim Lange's *Antibarbarus*; and from his German work, entitled the *Middle Way* (*Die Mittelstrasse*); and also from Val. Ern. Löseher's *Timotheus Verinus*, which is extant in two volumes.

cially by his *History of the Church and of Heresies*, which he, certainly without just grounds, entitled an *impartial* history.¹ By nature melancholy, gloomy, and austere, he applied himself to the reading of the works of the *mystics*, who very much resembled himself, till his mind was so wrought up, that he regarded them as the wisest men in the world, made all religion to consist in certain indescribable internal sensations and emotions, had little regard for doctrinal theology, and expended all the powers of his genius in collecting and exaggerating the faults of our own and former times. If, as all admit, it is the first excellence of an historian to afford no ground for suspicion of either partial or unfriendly feelings, no man was ever more unfit to be an historian than *Godfrey Arnold*. The man must be unable to see at all, who can read his history, and yet say that he does not see and feel that it is throughout dictated by passion and strong hatred of the received doctrines and institutions [of our church]. *Arnold* assumes it as an undeniable fact, in his history, that all the evils which have crept into the Christian church, since the times of the apostles, have originated from the ministers and rulers of the church, who were wicked and ungodly men. On this assumption, he supposes that all who made opposition to the priests and ministers of religion, and suffered persecution from them, were pious and holy men: and on the other hand that such as pleased the clergy, were mistaken and averse from true piety. Hence he defends nearly all the *heretics*, even those whose doctrines he had not examined and did not well understand; which has caused his book to give the highest offence. But the longer he lived, the more he saw the errors into which he had been betrayed by his natural temperament and by bad examples; and, as respectable persons affirm, he at last became more friendly to the truth and to moderation.²

¹ [Gottfried Arnold's *Unpartheyische Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*; first published 1699 and 1700, in 2 vols. folio, and then more full and complete, Schaffhausen, 1740, in 3 very thick vols. fol. *Tr.*]

² See Cöler's *Life of Arnold*, *Nouveau Dictionnaire Histor. Crit.* i. 485, &c. [Arnold was born at Anneberg in 1665. After passing his childhood at school in his native place, he spent three years in the gymnasium at Gera; and then, in 1685, entered the university of Wittenberg, where the next year he took his master's degree. Inclined to a retired and noiseless life, he removed to Dresden in 1686, where he became a private tutor, and was intimate with Spener. In 1693, he removed to Quedlinburg; and there acted as a private tutor in a family four years, declining repeated offers of a parish. In 1697, he was appointed professor of history at Giessen: but relinquished the office after two years, because, he said, 'no man can serve two masters; and professors, at that day, were required to teach in a manner that did not suit his taste.' He returned to Quedlinburg in

1698; where he was much admired and followed by the Pietists. In 1700, Sophia Charlotte, duchess of Eisenach, by recommendation of professor Franck, made him her court preacher. But opposition from the orthodox obliged him to quit the place, in 1705; and he was made pastor and inspector of Werben. Two years after, the king of Prussia made him pastor and inspector at Perleburg; where he died in 1713, aged 48. He was of a melancholy temperament, and drank deeply into the views of the Mystics and the Pietists, and conceived high disgust with the reigning theology around him. But he appears to have been a perfectly ingenuous and upright man. As an historian, he doubtless had strong prejudices, which often warped his judgment. But he appears to me very far from being a *passionate* writer; or from attempting, designedly, to discolour or misrepresent facts. See the character of him drawn by C. W. F. Walch, in his elaborate preface to Von Einem's translation of Mosheim, i. 88—201. *Tr.*]

§ 33. A much worse man than he was *Jo. Conrad Dippel*, a Hessian, who assumed the fictitious name of *Christian Democritus*, and also disquieted the minds of the weak, and excited no inconsiderable commotions in the last part of this century. This man, in my view, arrogant, vain-glorious, and formed by nature to be a caviller and a buffoon, did not so much bring forward a new form of religion, as labour to overthrow all those that were established. For, during his whole life, he was more intent on nothing, than on running down every religious community, and especially that of the Lutherans in which he was born, with his sarcastic witticisms: and rendering whatever had long been viewed with reverence, as ridiculous as possible, by his malignant and low scurrility. If—what I very much doubt, (for invention and imagination were by far his most prominent characteristics)—if, I say, he had in his own mind clear and distinct conceptions, which he thought were true, he certainly was incompetent to unfold them clearly and to express them in words; for it is only by divination, that a man can draw from his various writings any coherent and uniform system of doctrine. Indeed it would seem, as if the fire of his laboratory, over which he spent so much time, had produced a fever in his brain. His writings, should they be handed down to posterity, notwithstanding their crude, bitter, and sarcastic style, will cause people to wonder, that so many of their fathers could admit for their religious teacher and guide, one who so audaciously violated every principle of good sense and piety.¹

§ 34. Of a totally different character was *John William Petersen*, superintendent at Lüneburg; a man of a mild and quiet temper, but of a feeble mind, and very liable, from the luxuriance of his imagination, to deceive both himself and others. In the first place, he contended, in the year 1691, that a noble young lady *Rosamond Juliana of Asseburg*, whose disordered brain made her the subject of a sort of visions, actually saw God present, and reported commands which she received from Him; and about the same time, he publicly defended the obsolete doctrine of Christ's future reign, of a thousand years, on the earth: for that oracle had confirmed this, among other things, by *her* authority. This first error, as is usual with those who have no control over their own minds, afterwards produced others. For he, with his wife *Joanna Eleanora of Merlau*, who also professed to have very great spiritual knowledge, predicted a complete future restoration of all things, the liberation of both wicked men and devils from hell, their deliverance from all sin and from the punishment of sin; and assigned to Christ a twofold human nature, the one celestial, and assumed before this world was created, and the other derived from

¹ All his works were printed in 5 vols. 4to, in 1747, but without naming the place of publication. For he was respected by many after his death, and regarded as a great teacher of true wisdom. None more readily find readers and patrons, than those who abuse everybody else, and immoderately extol themselves. Dippel also ac-

quired numerous friends, by his attention to chemistry, in which he is said to have been well versed, and by his medical knowledge. For as all men are fond of riches and long life, they readily set a high value on those who professedly show them a sure path to opulence and old age. The death of Dippel is related by numerous writers.

his mother since the commencement of time. I pass over other opinions of this pair, equally groundless, and very wide of the common belief. Many gave assent to those opinions, especially among the laity: but *Petersen* was also opposed by great numbers; to whom he replied largely, as he had a fruitful genius and abundance of leisure. Being removed from his office, in the year 1692, he quietly passed the remainder of his life on his estate, near Magdeburg, amusing himself with writing letters and books.¹

§ 35. I know not whether I ought to associate with these, *John Caspar Schade* and *John George Boesius*, good men, and earnest to promote the salvation of others, but ignorant of the way to effect it. The former, a minister at Berlin, among the other crude and ill-digested doctrines which he advanced, most strenuously opposed, in 1697, that confession of sins to priests, which is practised among the Lutherans. His zeal on this subject produced considerable commotion, both in the church and the state. The latter, a preacher at

¹ *Petersen* gave a history of his own life, in German, first published in 1717, 8vo, to which his wife added her life, in 1718. Those who wish to investigate the spirit, habits, and character of this well-matched pair, will find matter enough for their purpose, in these autobiographies. Concerning his movements at Lüneburg, see the documents in the *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, A.D. 1748, p. 974, A.D. 1749, p. 30, 200, and in many other places. Add Jo. Möller's *Cimbria Litterata*, ii. 639, &c. [This pious and amiable enthusiast was born at Osnabrück, in 1649. Nature formed him for a poet; as appears from his *Urania*, on the mighty works of God, which *Leibnitz* published with his own amendments. He was made professor of poetry at Rostock, in 1677. Afterwards, he was superintendent at Lübeck; then court preacher at Lutin; and in 1688, superintendent at Lüneburg. He early gave way to a belief in visions and special revelations; which brought him to hold to a literal reign of Christ on the earth, during the millennium, and to believe in a final restoration of all things. Becoming more and more confirmed in these sentiments, he openly avowed them, both orally and in printed works. In 1692, he was cited before the consistory at Zell: and as he could not conscientiously refrain from teaching doctrines, which he supposed immediately revealed to himself, and wife, and lady Juliana, he was deprived of his office; and purchasing an estate, not far from Magdeburg, he there led a retired and religious life, chiefly occupied in defending his principles, and in labouring to promote practical piety, till his death in 1727. He was undoubtedly a considerable scholar, and a very sincere and pious man. But his poetic imagination, and his belief in dreams

and visions, led him to embrace very singular opinions. He supposed, that prior to the millennium, the Gospel would be preached over all the world, and that all nations would be converted. The Jews, after becoming Christians, would be restored to their own land. Now the first resurrection, that of the ancient saints and martyrs, would take place; Christ would appear in the clouds of heaven; and living saints would be caught up to meet the Lord in the air, and be changed. Thenceforth, Christ would reign a thousand years on the earth, over a twofold church; the celestial, composed of the risen saints and those changed at his coming, and the terrestrial, embracing all other Christians. Religion would prevail very generally, but not universally. At the end of a thousand years, Satan would be let loose; there would be great apostasy; Christ would come forth and destroy the wicked; a new heaven and a new earth would appear; and gradually all things would be restored to order, and holiness, and happiness. Though *Petersen* was first led into these doctrines by supposed revelations, and appears always to have founded his *own* belief chiefly on such grounds; yet he believed, that the Scriptures, rightly interpreted, that is, mystically explained, were full of these doctrines. And hence, in order to convince others, he argued much from the Bible, particularly from the Apocalypse, and also from the ancient Chiliasts, especially Origen. His writings were voluminous; consisting of mystic interpretations of Scripture, defence of his peculiar sentiments, many letters, and history of his own life. See Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation*, viii. 302, &c. *Unpartheyische Kirchen-historie*, Jena, 1730, ii. 811, &c. Tr.]

Sorau,¹ in order more effectually to overcome the heedlessness and security of men, denied, that God continues to be propitious to those sinners, whose obstinacy he foresaw eternally to be incurable, to the end of their lives; or, what is the same thing, that beyond a certain limited time, fixed from eternity, he would afford them the grace necessary for the attainment of salvation. This opinion was thought by not a few divines to be injurious to the Divine mercy, which is boundless; and it was therefore combated in many publications. Yet it found a learned vindicator in *Adam Rechenberg*, a divine of Leipsic; not to mention others of less note.²

§ 36. Among the minor controversies in the Lutheran church, I shall assign the first place to that which existed between the divines of Tübingen and those of Giessen, from the year 1616. The grand point in debate related to the true nature and circumstances of that state of *Christ*, which theologians usually call his state of *humiliation*. The parties agreed, that the *man* Christ Jesus really possessed divine properties and perfections, by virtue of the *hypostatic union*, even while he appeared divested of all glory and majesty, nay, seemed to be a vile servant and malefactor. But they disputed, whether he actually *divested* himself of the use of those perfections, while executing the office of high priest, or whether he only *concealed* his use of them from the view of men. The divines of Tübingen accounted the latter supposition to be the fact; while those of Giessen regarded the former as more probable. To this first and great question, others were added; which, if I am correct, were rather curious than necessary, respecting the mode in which God is present throughout the created universe, the origin and ground of this presence, the true cause of the omnipresence of Christ's body, and some others. On the side of the Tübingen divines, appeared and took part *Lucas Osiander*, *Melchior Nicolai*, and *Theodore Thummus*; and on the side of the divines of Giessen, *Balthazar Menzer* and *Justus Feuerborn*: all of whom contended ardently and ingeniously; and I wish I could add, always with dignity and moderation. But those times permitted and approved many things, which subsequent times have justly required to be amended. The Saxon theologians, in the year 1624, by order of their sovereign, assumed the office of arbiters of the controversy: and this office they so executed, as not to approve entirely the sentiments of either party; yet they intimated, that the views of the Giessen divines were nearer the truth than those of the other party.³ The Tübingen divines refused to admit their interference: and perhaps, the divines of Giessen would in time have done the same. But the public calamities of Germany put an end

¹ [In Lower Lusatia. *Tr.*]

² Those who wish to understand these controversies may consult Walch's *Introduction to the Controversies in the Lutheran Church*, written in German.

³ Jo. Wolfig. Jaeger's *Hist. Eccles. et Polit.* sæc. xvii. decenn. iii. p. 329, &c. Christ.

Eberh. Weismann's *Historia Eccles. sæc. xvii.* p. 1178. Walch's *Introduction to the Controversies*, &c. [in German], pt. i. ch. iv. p. 206: to say nothing of Andr. Caroli, Arnold, and a hundred others. [These controversies were natural results of Luther's doctrine of consubstantiation. *Tr.*]

to the contest. It was, therefore, never settled; but each party retained its own views.

§ 37. Not long after the rise of this contest, in the year 1621, *Herman Rathmann*, minister at Dantzic, a pious man, and not unlearned, a great friend and a public recommender of *John Arndt's* work on True Christianity, was thought by *John Corvinus*, his colleague, and by many others, to derogate from the majesty and the efficacy of the Holy Scriptures. If we may believe his adversaries, he published, in the year 1621, in a German work on Christ's kingdom of Grace, the following sentiment: 'That the written word of God does not possess inherent power and efficacy to enlighten and regenerate the hearts of men, and to convert them to God: that this external word merely points out the way to salvation, but does not draw men into it: that God Himself, by another and an internal word, so changes the dispositions of men, that they are enabled to please Him.' This opinion, *Corvinus* and his associates contended, was the same that *Schwenckfeld* formerly held, and that the mystics professed. But whoever shall compare together all the writings of *Rathmann* on the subject, will perceive, that his adversaries either did not understand him, or have perverted his meaning. He supposed, I. That the word of God, as contained in the Scriptures, had the power of converting men to God, and of renewing their hearts. But, II. This power it could not exert at all on the minds of corrupt men who resisted it. Therefore, III. It was necessary that a divine power should either precede or accompany it, and prepare the minds of men for its influence, or remove the obstacles which destroyed the efficacy of the external word. And thus, IV. By this power of the Holy Spirit, or this internal word, the way was prepared for the external word to enlighten and renovate the souls of men.¹ There is indeed some difference between his views of the efficacy of the divine word, and the common views of the Lutheran church: but, if I do not greatly deceive myself, whoever shall carefully consider all that he has written on the subject, in his inelegant, nay, often careless manner, will be convinced that this difference is but small; and he will perceive that the honest man had not the power of communicating his thoughts with precision and clearness. The controversy spread through the whole Lutheran church; the majority following the example of the Saxons and condemning *Rathmann*: but others excusing that pious and good man. But as he died, just as the contest was at its height, in the year 1628, those great commotions gradually subsided.

§ 38. The private dissensions of some of the doctors respecting certain propositions and opinions, I do not presume to place on the list of Lutheran controversies: though I perceive some do it; not so much, however, if I do not mistake, for the purpose of illustrating

¹ See Christopher Hartknoch's *Preussische Kirchengeschichte*, book iii. ch. viii. p. 812, &c. Godfrey Arnold's *Kirchen- und Ketzer-*
historie, pt. iii. ch. xii. p. 115, &c. Jo. Möller's *Cimbria Litterata*, iii. 559, &c.

and adorning the history of the church, as to create prejudice against the Lutherans, and to lower the reputation of good men. For no age is so happy, and no community so well regulated, but that one individual is sometimes deemed by another to be indiscreet and erroneous. Nor is it estimating human nature correctly, to measure the state of things, throughout the whole church, by such private opinions of individuals. In the writings of *John Tarnovius* and *John Affelmann* of Rostock, in other respects two very meritorious theologians, certain modes of expression and some opinions were censured, by their colleagues and others. Nor will this excite much surprise in one who considers that the latter might misunderstand what was itself well said, and that the former might not have known how to express correctly what they clearly understood. *Joachim Lütke- mann*, in many respects a man of worth, denied, that Christ remained a true man, during the three days He was dead: while others affirmed the contrary. This was a controversy about words; such as we see continually arising and disappearing among men. Of the same kind was the dispute which engaged *Henry Boetius*, a theologian of Helmstadt, and *Frederic Baldwin*, a divine of Wittemberg; whether it is in consequence of the merits of Christ, that the wicked will be restored to life hereafter. *John Reinboth*, superintendent in Holstein, like *Calixtus*, circumscribed the essentials of religion within narrower limits than general practice warrants, and considered the Greeks to err but lightly, in denying that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Son. In both respects, many were satisfied with him; but others were not; and especially, *John Conrad Danhauer*, a very learned divine of Strasburg. Hence a controversy arose between those excellent men, which was more vehement than the nature of the case demanded.¹ But let us not refer disputes of this character to the class of those which show the internal state of our church in this century.

§ 39. Of somewhat greater moment in this respect, were certain controversies, which did not relate so much to things, as to persons; or respected the soundness and correctness of certain teachers. Men who undertake to plead the cause of piety and holiness, are often carried by the fervour which actuates them to some extravagance; and therefore do not always confine their statements down to the rigid rules of theological accuracy, prescribed by learned divines: and they sometimes borrow the strong and splendid, yet figurative and often obscure, words and phrases of those, who treat of the genuine worship of God and of practical duties, with good intentions indeed, yet in a rude and uncouth style. Hence none scarcely more readily than these fall under the suspicion of despising and marring the truth. Many such examples occurred in this age; and, particularly, in the case of *Stephen Prætorius*, a preacher at Salzwedel,

¹ See, on these controversies generally, Godfrey Arnold's *Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*, pt. ii. book xvii. ch. vi. p. 957, &c.; and concerning that of Reinboth, in particu-

lar, see Jo. Möller's *Introduct. ad Historiam Chersonesi Cimbricæ*, pt. ii. p. 190, &c. and *Cimbria Litterata*, ii. 692.

and of that most excellent man *John Arndt*. The former had published, in the preceding century, some tracts, calculated to arouse the minds of men to solicitude about their salvation; and these were repeatedly republished in this century, and commended by many; and yet were thought by others to abound in expressions and sentiments, either directly false, or calculated to lead on to error. And there certainly are some unsuitable expressions in those tracts which might easily mislead the ignorant; and some also, that indicate too great credulity. Yet, whoever shall read his works with an ingenuous mind, will easily believe, that the writer composed nothing there, treacherously, and with a bad design. The celebrated work of *Arndt*, on true Christianity, the perusal of which affords delight to so many pious persons even in our times, was too bitterly taxed by *Lucas Osiander*, *George Rost*, and many others, with being written, among other faults, in a style that was debased by Weigelian, Paracelsic, and the like phraseology. And it is certain, that this extraordinary man disliked the philosophy which prevailed in the schools of that age, and on the other hand, ascribed much,—I had almost said, too much,—to the doctrines and pretensions of the chemists: and hence he sometimes used the language of those who tell us, that fire throws light on both religion and nature. But he has been absolved from all great errors, by the most respectable men, especially by *Paul Egard*, *Daniel Dilger*, *Melchior Breler*, *John Gerhard*, *Dorscheus*, and numerous others: and, indeed, he appears to have derived reputation and renown, rather than disgrace, from so many criminations.¹ To the class of which we here treat, belongs also *Valentine Weigel*, minister of Tschopau in Meissen. For though he died in the preceding century, yet a great part of his writings first appeared in this, and gave occasion to very numerous attacks. I regard him as by no means a corrupt man; but he also was injured by his attachment to the chemistry which at that time floated about Germany, and by his dislike or neglect of the precepts of sound reason.²

§ 40. It remains, that we notice the chief persons among the Lutherans, who felt themselves strong enough to remodel the whole system of theology, and to draw forth a new one from their own resources. At the head of the list stands *Jacob Boehmen*, a shoemaker of Görlitz, famous for his vast number of both friends and foes, and whom his patrons call the *German Theosophist*. Being naturally inclined to search after abstruse things, and having learned, partly from certain books, and partly from intercourse with some physicians (*Tobias Kober*, *Balthasar Walther*, and others), the doctrines of *Robert Fludd* and the Rosicrucians, which were then everywhere circulated and talked of, he discovered, by means of fire, and with the aid of his imagination, a kind of theology, which was more

¹ See Godfr. Arnold's *Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*, pt. ii. book xvii. ch. vi. p. 940, &c. Weismann's *Historia Eccles.* sec. xvii. p. 1174, 1189. Godfr. Balth. Scharf's *Supplementum Historiæ, Litisquæ Arndianæ*,

Wittem. 1727, 8vo, and very many others.

² Arnold treats largely on Weigel; yet, as usual, not impartially; in his *Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*, pt. ii. book xvii. ch. xvii. p. 1088.

obscure than the numbers of Pythagoras, or the characters of Heraclitus. Those who would commend the man for ingenuity, piety, veracity and honesty, may do it without hindrance from us: but those who would honour him with the title of a man taught of God, or even of a sound and wise philosopher, must be themselves in want of light; for he so confuses every subject with chemical metaphors, and with such a profusion of obscure terms, that it would seem as if he wanted to stun himself. The heat of his exuberant fancy, if I do not mistake, led him to believe that divine grace operates according to the same laws that prevail in the physical world; and that men's souls are purged from their pollutions and vices in no other way than metals are from dross. He formerly had, and he still has, a great number of followers; among whom, in this century, the most noted and famous were *John Lewis Giftheil*, *John Angelus von Werdenhagen*, *Abraham von Franckenberg*, *Theodore von Tzetsch*, *Paul Felgenhauer*, *Quirinus Kuhlmann*, *John James Zimmermann*, and others. Some of these were not altogether destitute of modesty and good understanding: but others were evidently out of their wits, and excited the compassion of intelligent men; as e.g. *Kuhlmann*, who was burnt in Muscovy, A.D. 1684, and afterwards *Gichtel*: nor did any one of them manage matters with such skill and credit as to procure for the school and its founder the smallest portion of commendation and respectability, with people even of moderate discernment.¹

§ 41. Next after *Boehmen*, it appears, should be mentioned those, whom a sort of intellectual weakness rendered so daring, that they boasted of being prophets, divinely raised up, and endued with the power of foretelling future events. A large number of such persons existed in this age, and particularly during the times when the Austrians were contending for supremacy against the Germans, the Swedes, and the French: for long experience shows, that there is never a greater number of diviners or prophets, than when great revolutions seem about to take place, or when great and unexpected calamities occur. The most noted of these were *Nicolas Drabez*, *Christopher Kotter*, *Christina Poniatowsky* (who have found an eloquent patron in *John Amos Comenius*), also *Joachim Greulich*, *Anna Vetteria*, *Eva Maria Frölich*, *George Reichard*, and some others. But as no one of them was the cause of any great commotions, and as the progress of events very soon divested their predictions of all their authority, it is sufficient to have shown, generally, that

¹ It is not necessary here to cite authorities: for the works of *Boehmen* are in everybody's hands; and the books which confute him are nowhere scarce. What can be said in favour of the man and his followers, may be seen in *Arnold*, who is always most full in extolling and lauding those whom others censure. Concerning *Kuhlmann*, and his execution, see the *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, A.D. 1748, p. 905, and in many

other places.—[‘*Boehmen*, however, had the good fortune to meet with, in our days, a warm advocate and an industrious disciple in the late well-meaning, but gloomy and visionary, Mr. William Law, who was, for many years, preparing a new edition and translation of *Boehmen's* works, which he left behind him ready for the press, and which has been published in 2 vols. 4to. since his death.’ *Macl.*]

there were among the Lutherans of this age some disordered minds, that affected the honours and the authority of ambassadors of heaven.¹

§ 42. I would give a somewhat more distinct account of some, who were not indeed so wholly out of their wits as to claim to be prophets of God, yet sadly deceived themselves and others by marvellous and strange opinions. *Esaias Stiefel* and *Ezekiel Meth*, both of Thuringia, not long after the commencement of the century, expressed themselves so unusually and so improperly, that they were thought by many to arrogate to themselves divine glory and majesty, to the great dishonour of God and our Saviour. I can believe, that although sound sense was far away from them, yet they were still among the comparatively sane; but they foolishly imitated the lofty and swollen phraseology of the mystical writers. Thus they may serve as examples to show how much cloudiness and folly the constant reading of mystical books may spread over uncultivated and feeble minds.² *Paul Nagel*, a professor at Leipsic, who had some tincture of mathematical knowledge, conjectured from the stars future occurrences both in church and state; and, among other things, professed to be certain, from their indications, that a very holy and heavenly kingdom of Christ was to be set up on the earth.³

§ 43. *Christian Hoburg*, of Lüneburg, a man of an unstable and turbulent spirit, under the assumed names of *Elias Prætorius* and *Bernard Baumann*, published a vast number of invectives against the whole Lutheran church; and thereby involved himself in various troubles. Yet for a long time, by dissimulation and deception, which he, doubtless, considered as lawful, he led the more charitable to regard him as less faulty than he actually was; and he was accounted rather too sharp an adversary, not so much of religion itself, as of the licentiousness and vices of those especially who ministered in holy things. At length, he rendered himself universally odious, and went over to the Mennonites.⁴ Very similar to him, though superior in petulance and acrimony, was *Frederic Breckling*: who being ejected from the ministry, which he first exercised in Holstein and afterwards at Zwoil, in Holland, lived to extreme old age, in that country, connected with no religious sect. Various tracts of his are

¹ Godfrey Arnold has done the world service by accurately collecting the visions and acts of these people, in the second and third parts of his *Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*. For now, such as have occasion to investigate the subject, have the ready means of ascertaining with certainty, what was in itself most probable beforehand, that what these persons deemed divine communications were the fictions of their own minds, led away by their imaginations. There was an honest, illiterate man at Amsterdam, in the middle of the seventeenth century, Benedict Bahnsen of Holstein, who was so captivated with such writings and prophecies, that he carefully collected and published

them all. His *Index Bibliothecæ* was printed after his death, Amsterd. 1670, 4to, embracing a great number of chemical, fanatical, and prophetic writings.

² See Christ. Thomasius, *Hist. der Weisheit und Narrheit*, vol. i. pt. iii. p. 150. Godfr. Arnold's *Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*, pt. iii. ch. iv. p. 32.

³ Arnold, *l. c.* pt. iii. ch. v. p. 53. Andrew Caroli, *Memorabilia Eccles.* sæc. xvii. pt. i. l. iii. c. iv. p. 513.

⁴ Arnold, *l. c.* pt. iii. ch. xiii. p. 130. Andrew Caroli, *l. c.* i. 1065. Jo. Hornbeck, *Summa Controvers.* p. 536. Jo. Möller, *Cimbria Litterata*, ii. 337, &c.

extant, which, although they very vehemently urge and recommend the cultivation of piety, and display implacable hatred against both vice and the vicious, yet show the writer to have been destitute of the primary virtues of a truly pious man, namely, charity, wisdom, the love of truth, meekness, and patience.¹ It is strange that such vehement and heated declaimers against the defects of the public religion and its ministers, as they profess to be more discerning than all others, should fail of discovering, what the most simple daily learn by common observation, that nothing is more odious and disgusting than an angry reformer, who is always threatening fire and sword; and that they should not perceive the very little chance which any one has of dealing successfully with such faults in others, as he labours under himself. The expectation of the millennial kingdom, which seldom exists in well-informed minds, and which generally produces extravagant opinions, was embraced and propagated by *George Lawrence Seidenbecher*, a preacher in the Saxon district of *Eichsfeld*: and for this he was deprived of his office.²

§ 44. We shall close the list of this disordered family (for it is not necessary to name a great number, since they all pursued much the same course) with the most odious and the worst of them all, *Martin Seidelius*, a Silesian of *Ohlau*; who laboured to establish a sect in Poland and the neighbouring countries, near the close of the preceding century and the commencement of this, but whose extreme absurdities prevented him from meeting with success even among the Socinians. This most daring of mortals supposed that God had indeed promised a Saviour or a Messiah to the Jewish nation; but that this Messiah had never appeared, nor ever would appear, because the Jews, by their sins, had rendered themselves unworthy of this so great a deliverer, whom God once promised to their fathers: that of course, *Christ* was erroneously regarded as the Messiah: that it was his only business and office to explain the law of nature, which had been greatly obscured by the fault of men: and therefore, that whoever shall obey this law, as expounded by Jesus Christ, will fulfil all the religious duties which God requires of him. To render these monstrous opinions more defensible and specious, he audaciously assailed and discarded all the books of the New Testament. The few persons whom he brought over to his views, were called *Semi-Judaizers*.³ If this daring man had lived at the present day, he would have appeared much less odious, than he did in that age. For

¹ Arnold treats on this man, in his work so often cited, p. iii. ch. xiii. p. 148, &c. and pt. iv. p. 1103, &c. and likewise gives us some of his tracts; which abundantly show the extreme fertility of his genius; *ibid.* p. 1110. A formal account of him is given by John Möller, *Cimbria Litterata*, iii. 72, &c.

² He is fully described by Alb. Meno Verpoorten, in his *Comment. de Vita et Institutis G. L. Seidenbecheri*; Dantzg, 1739, 4to.

³ See Gustav. George Zeltner's *Historia Crypto-Socinismi Altorfini*, vol. i. p. 268, 335. [His *Fundamenta Religionis Christianæ*, and his *Epistolæ tres ad Cætrum Unitariorum*, are to be found in the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Unitariorum*. *Schl.*—A sect still exists, in Russia, holding much the same doctrines, and bearing the name of *Seleznévtschini*. See R. Pinkerton's *Present State of the Greek Church*, ed. New York, 1815, p. 273, comp. p. 228. *Tr.*]

if we except his singular ideas concerning the Messiah, all the rest of his system would be highly approved by many, at the present day, among the English, the Dutch, and other nations.

CHAPTER II.

HISTORY OF THE REFORMED CHURCH.

§ 1. Enlargement of the Reformed church — § 2. Its decrees. Fall of the French church — § 3. Persecutions of the Reformed French church — § 4. Revocation of the edict of Nantes — § 5. Persecutions of the Waldensians and the Palatines — § 6. State of learning and philosophy — § 7. Biblical interpretation — § 8. Dogmatic theology — § 9. State of moral theology — § 10. Controversies concerning grace and predestination — § 11. The Arminian schism — § 12. Its effects — § 13. Singular opinions of the French church — § 14. Contest of the Hypothetical Universalists — § 15. La Place and Cappel — § 16. Lewis le Blanc — § 17, 18. Claude Pajon — § 19. State of the English church under James I. — § 20. Charles I. — § 21. The Independents — § 22. Cromwell's reign — § 23. English Antinomians — § 24. Latitudinarians — § 25. Church of England under Charles II. and his successors — § 26. High church or Non-jurors, among the English — § 27. Their opinions — § 28. Contests among the Dutch — § 29. The Cartesian and Cocceian controversies — § 30. The Cartesian — § 31. The opinion of the Cocceians respecting the Holy Scriptures — § 32. Their theological opinions — § 33. Roellian contest, respecting the use of reason — § 34. Respecting the generation of the Son of God, &c. — § 35. Becker — § 36. Dutch sects. Verschorists, Hattenists — § 37. Commotions in Switzerland. The *Formula Consensus*.

§ 1. THE Reformed church, as has been already remarked, being united not so much by the bonds of a common faith and discipline, as by principles of moderation and candour, it will be proper to consider, first, whatever relates to this very extensive community as a whole, and then the events worthy of notice in the several Reformed countries. The principal enlargements of this community in the seventeenth century, have already been mentioned in our account of the Hessian and Brandenburg commotions, in the chapter on the Lutheran church. We here add, that *John Adolphus*, duke of Holstein, in the beginning of this century, also went over to the side of the Reformed: and much hope was indulged that his subjects would be led gradually to follow his example; but the prince dying in the year 1616, this hope was frustrated.¹ *Henry* duke of Saxony, in the year 1688, at Dessau, exchanged the Lutheran religion, in which he had been educated, for that of the Reformed, at the instigation, it is said, of his wife.² In the beginning of the century, there were in

¹ Jo. Möller's *Introduct. ad Historiam Chersonesi Cimbrica*, pt. ii. p. 101, &c. Eric Pontoppidan's *Annales Ecclesiæ Danicæ Diplomaticæ*, iii. 691, &c.

² See George Moebius, *Selectæ Dissp. Theolog.* p. 1137. This prince published a

confession of his Faith: which being attacked by the Leipsic divines by public authority, Isaac de Beausobre, who was then pastor of the church of Magdeburg, composed a vindication of it: *Défense de la Doctrine des Réformés, et en particulier de la Confession*

Denmark many who secretly leaned towards the doctrines of the Reformed, and especially in regard to the Lord's supper, and who had received their instruction from *Nicholas Hemming*, and other friends of *Melancthon*. But these persons lost all their hopes, courage, and influence, after the year 1614, when *John Canutius*, a bishop who had too openly avowed his good-will towards Calvinistic opinions, was deprived of his office.¹ It is well known that the Reformed religion was transplanted by the Dutch and the English into Africa, Asia, and America; and in various parts of those continents very flourishing Reformed churches were established; and among the Lutherans also, liberty was granted everywhere to the French, German, and English Reformed, freely to set up their worship.

§ 2. Of all the public calamities which diminished the splendour and the prosperity of the Reformed community, the greatest and most lamentable was the subversion of the French church, which had produced so many renowned men. From the times of *Henry IV.* the Reformed church in France constituted a kind of state or commonwealth within the commonwealth; being fortified by great privileges and rights, and possessing, among other things, for its security, towns and castles, and especially the very strong fortress of Rochelle; all which places were garrisoned with its own troops. This community was not always under leaders of sufficient foresight and attachment to the crown. Hence, sometimes (for the truth should not be concealed), when civil wars or commotions broke out, this community took the side of those that were opposed to the king; engaged at times in enterprises which the king disliked; too openly sought alliance and friendship with the Dutch and the English; and undertook or aimed at other things, inconsistent, apparently at least, with the public peace and the supreme authority of the king. Hence the king, *Lewis XIII.*, from the year 1621, waged war with the Reformed party; and the prime minister of France, cardinal *Richelieu*, was persuaded that France would never be safe and enjoy peace, until this community was overthrown and deprived of its fortifications, castles, strong towns, and high privileges. *Richelieu*, after various conflicts, and numerous efforts, at last obtained his object. For in the year 1628, after a long and difficult siege, he took Rochelle, the chief fortress of the Reformed community, and reduced it under subjection to the king: and this city being captured, it was all over with the Reformed church of France; which, being deprived of its fortresses, could depend upon nothing but the king's clemency and good pleasure.² Those who judge of this transaction by the principles of state policy, deny that it was a violation of all justice and equity:

de Foy de S. A. Monseigneur le Duc Henry de Saxe, contre un Livre composé par la Faculté de Théologie de Leipsic; Magdeb. 1694, 8vo.

¹ Pontoppidan's *Annales Eccles. Danicæ*, iii. 695, &c.

² See Jo. le Clerc's *Vie du Cardinal*

Richelieu, i. 69, 77, 177, 199, 269. Mich. le Vassor's *Hist. de Louis XIII.* iii. 676, &c. iv. 1, &c. and the subsequent volumes. Add the Duke of Sully (a friend to Henry IV., himself one of the Reformed, but not disposed to conceal the errors of his church), *Mémoires*, iii. iv. v.

because such communities in the bosom of a kingdom or state are pernicious, and most hazardous to the public peace and safety. And if the French court had stopped here, and had left safe and inviolate to the Reformed their liberties of conscience and religion, purchased with a deluge of blood and great achievements, perhaps the Reformed could, and would, have borne the immense loss of their liberties and rights with equanimity.

§ 3. But the French court was not content with this measure of success: having destroyed that form or species of civil polity, which had been annexed to the Reformed church, and which afterwards was deemed adverse to the regal power, the court next attacked the church itself, and its religion, contrary to the plighted faith of the kings. At first milder measures were resorted to, promises, caresses, conciliatory expositions of the doctrines particularly offensive to the Reformed, and similar measures, both with the head men of the Reformed community, and with the more learned and eminent of their ministers; and *Richelieu* especially spared no pains or arts which he thought might have any influence to draw the Reformed insidiously into the Roman church. But as little or nothing was effected by all these measures, the catholic bishops especially resorted to sophistry, persecution, the most unrighteous laws, and all the means which either blind passion or ingenious malice could invent, in order gradually to exhaust the people who were so hateful to them, and compel them, against their choice, reluctantly to join the standard of the Roman pontiff. Many yielded, being overcome by their troubles and very grievous sufferings; others left the country; but the greatest part firmly persisted in the religion of their fathers.

§ 4. At length, under *Lewis XIV.*, after all artifices, snares, and projects had been exhausted in vain, the prelates of the Gallic church and the Jesuits, to whom the king was accustomed to listen, determined that this most resolute body of people must be extirpated by violence and war, and crushed as it were by a single stroke. Overcome by their arguments and importunate supplications, *Lewis*, in the year 1685, with the approbation and applause of the Roman pontiff, in violation of all laws human and divine, repealed the edict of Nantes, by which his grandfather had granted to the Reformed the liberty of worshipping God according to their own consciences; and commanded his Reformed subjects to return to the religion of their progenitors. The consequence of this most lamentable decree was, that a vast multitude of French people abandoned their country, to the immense detriment of France,¹ and sought new abiding places, in

¹ See the excellent remarks and observations of Armand de la Chapelle, on this subject, in his *Life of Isaac de Beausobre*, subjoined to the posthumous Notes of the latter on the New Testament, p. 259, &c. [The edict of Nantes, which gave free toleration to the protestants, was drawn up and sanctioned by Henry IV. in 1598; and confirmed by Lewis XIII. A.D. 1613. Its re-

vocation in 1685 was preceded by the despatch of soldiers into all the provinces, to compel the protestants to abandon their religion. Notwithstanding the great pains taken to prevent their escape from the kingdom, some say half a million, and others say eight hundred thousand, protestants found their way to foreign countries. Nearly forty thousand are said to have passed over

various parts of Europe, in which they might freely serve God : and the others, whom the extreme vigilance of their enemies prevented from acquiring safety by flight, the soldiers compelled, by a thousand modes of torture, vexation, and suffering, to profess with their lips, and to exhibit in their outward conduct, that Romish religion which they abhorred in their hearts.¹ From this unrighteous act of the (on other occasions magnanimous) king, it may be seen how the Roman pontiffs and their adherents stand affected towards those whom they call *heretics*; and that they regard no treaty and no oath as too sacred and too solemn to be violated, if the safety or the interests of their church demand it.

§ 5. The *Waldenses*, inhabiting the valleys of Piedmont, who had formed an union, as has been already mentioned, with the church of Geneva, were tormented, through the whole century almost, by the cruellest devices and machinations of the Roman prelate's emissaries; but especially, in the years 1655, 1686, and 1696, they were so oppressed and harassed that they had extreme difficulty in escaping extermination.² Those who survived these frequent butcheries, owed their precarious and dubious safety to the intercessions of the Dutch, the English, and the Swiss, with the duke of Savoy. In Germany, the church of the Palatinate, which was once a principal branch of the Reformed community, from the year 1685, when the government passed into the hands of a prince given up to Romanism, gradually suffered so much diminution, that from holding the first rank, it was depressed to almost the lowest among the Reformed churches of Germany.

§ 6. As the merits of the Reformed body in every branch of useful knowledge, are extremely great and everywhere notorious, we shall not dwell upon them. We shall also omit the names of the great and distinguished authors, whose works procured permanent fame for themselves, and great advantage to others; because it is difficult, amidst so great a number, to select the best.³ In philosophy, the

to England; whence many of them went to America. Vast numbers settled in Holland; and large numbers in the protestant states of Germany, particularly in Prussia, and in Switzerland and Denmark. See Gifford's *History of France*, iv. 35, 92, 421, &c. Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Reformation*, viii. 470, &c. Tr.]

¹ No one has illustrated these events more fully than Elias Benoit, *Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes*; a noble work, published at Delft, 1693, &c. in 5 vols. 4to. See also Voltaire, *Siècle de Louis XIV.* ii. 229.

² Jo. Leger, *Histoire Générale des Eglises Vaudoises*, pt. ii. ch. vi. p. 72, &c. Peter Gilles, *Hist. Ecclesiastique des Eglises Vaudoises*, c. xlix. p. 353, &c. There is extant a particular history of the calamities sustained by the Waldenses, in 1686, printed at Rotterdam, 1688, 12mo. [See also An Account of the late persecutions of the Waldenses

by the duke of Savoy and the French king, in 1686; printed, Oxford, 1688, 4to, and Peter Boyer's *History of the Vaudois*, c. xii.—xvi. p. 72, &c. Tr.]

³ ['The list of the eminent divines and men of learning, that were ornaments to the Reformed church in the 17th century, is indeed extremely ample. Among those that adorned Great Britain, we shall always remember with peculiar veneration the immortal names of Newton, Barrow, Cudworth, Boyle, Chillingworth, Ussher, Bedell, Hall, Pocock, Fell, Lightfoot, Hammond, Calamy, Walton, Baxter, Pearson, Stillingfleet, Mede, Parker, Oughtred, Burnet, Tillotson, and many others well known in the literary world. In Germany we find Pareus, Scultet, Fabricius, Alting, Pelargus, and Bergius. In Switzerland and Geneva, Hospinian, the two Buxtorfs, Hottinger, Heidegger, and Turretin. In the churches

sole guide and lawgiver everywhere for a long time, just as among the Lutherans, was *Aristotle*; and, moreover, the very *Aristotle* that is portrayed to us by the scholastic writers. But his authority gradually became very much diminished from the time of *Gassendi* and *Des Cartes*. For many of the French and Dutch adopted the Cartesian philosophy, upon its first appearance; and a large part of the English chose *Gassendi* for their guide and teacher. This was exceedingly offensive to the Aristotelians; who everywhere, but most pugnaciously in Holland, laboured to persuade the people, that immense danger to religion and the truth was to be apprehended from the abandonment of *Aristotle*; nor would they suffer themselves to be ousted from the schools.¹ But the splendour of the increasing light, and the influence of liberty, compelled the pertinacious sect to yield and be silent: so that the Reformed doctors, at the present day, philosophize as freely as the Lutherans do. Yet I am far from sure that *Aristotle* does not still exercise a secret sway in the English universities. This at least I could easily prove, that in the times of *Charles II.*, *James II.*, and *William III.*, while the mathematical philosophy prevailed nearly throughout Great Britain, yet at Oxford and Cambridge the old philosophy was in higher repute, with some, than the new discoveries.

§ 7. The expositors of Scripture among the Reformed, who adorned the commencement of the century, all trod in the steps of *Calvin*; and according to his example, they did not search after recondite meanings and types, but investigated solely the import of the words of the sacred writers. But this uniformity, in process of time, was done away, by the influence of two very distinguished interpreters, *Hugo Grotius* and *John Cocceius*. The former, departing but slightly from *Calvin's* manner, investigates only the literal sense, in the books of both the Old Testament and the New; considers the predictions of the ancient prophets as being all fulfilled in events anterior to the coming of Christ, and therefore, in the letter of them, as not to be applied to Christ: yet he supposes, that in some of those prophecies, especially in such as the writers of the New Testament apply to Christ, there is, besides the literal sense, a secret or *mystical* sense, concealed under the persons, events, and things described, which relates to Christ, to his history and mediation. Very different were the principles of *Cocceius*. He supposed that the whole Old Testament history was a kind of emblematic history of *Christ*, and of the Christian church; that the prophecies of the ancient prophets, in their literal import, treated of *Jesus Christ*;

and academies of Holland, we meet with the following learned divines: *Drusus*, *Amama*, *Gomar*, *Rivet*, *Cloppenburgh*, *Vossius*, *Cocceius*, *Voetius*, *Des Marets*, *Heidan*, *Momma*, *Burman*, *Wittichius*, *Hornbeck*, the *Spanheims*, *Le Moynes*, *De Maastricht*; among the French doctors, we may reckon *Cameron*, *Chamier*, *Du Moulin*, *Mestrezat*,

Blondel, *Drelincourt*, *Daillé*, *Amyraut*, the two *Cappels*, *De la Place*, *Garnstole*, *Croy*, *Morus*, *Le Blanc*, *Pajon*, *Bochart*, *Claude*, *Alix*, *Jurieu*, *Basnage*, *Abbadie*, *Beausobre*, *Lefant*, *Martin*, *Des Vignoles*, &c.' *Macl.*]

¹ See *Andrew Baillet*, *Vie de M. des Cartes*; in numerous passages.

and that whatever was to occur in the Christian church, down to the end of time, was all prefigured in the Old Testament, in some places more clearly, and in others less so.¹ Each of these men had a multitude of followers and disciples. With the former, were, besides the Arminians, those adherents to the old Calvinistic system, who, from *Gilbert Voet*, the principal antagonist of *Cocceius*, were called *Voëtians*; also many of the English, and a great number of the French. The latter was highly admired by not a few of the Dutch, the Swiss, and the Germans. Yet there are many, who stand intermediate between these two classes of interpreters; agreeing with neither throughout, but with each in part. Moreover, neither the *Grotian* interpreters, nor the *Cocceian*, are all of the same description; but each class is subdivided into various subordinate classes. No contemptible portion of the English *Episcopalians*, despising these modern guides, think that the first doctors of the nascent church ought to be consulted, and deny that the sacred books are to be expounded otherwise than as the *Fathers* expounded them.²

§ 8. The doctrines of Christianity were disfigured, among the Reformed, just as among ourselves, by Peripatetic, or, if you like, scholastic daubing. The entire subjugation of these doctrines to the empire of Aristotle, and their reduction to the form of a Peripatetic science, was first resisted by the Arminians; who followed a more simple mode of teaching, and inveighed most loudly against such divines as subjected the doctrines relating to man's salvation to the artificial distinctions and phraseology of the schools. Next followed the Cartesians and the Cocceians; the former of whom applied the principles of their philosophy to the explication of revealed truth; while the latter judged that the whole system of theology would appear to the best advantage if dressed up in the form and garb of a divine covenant with men. But grave and wise men among the Reformed were pleased with neither of these. For they objected that the sacred doctrines would be rendered no less obscure and intricate by the Cartesian distinctions and peculiar conceptions, than by the Peripatetic phraseology and distinctions. Nor did they see how a covenant could furnish an analogy suitable for application to theology, without producing this evil, among others which no good man can approve, that it would make the phraseology and subtle distinctions of lawyers pass over into the schools of divines, and find an opening for vain and futile contentions upon subjects of the holiest kind. Most of the English and the French would not consent to be

¹ It is commonly said: 'Cocceius finds Christ everywhere, but Grotius nowhere, in the pages of the Old Testament.' The first part of the adage is most true: the last is not so true. For Grotius, as his commentaries fully show, does find Christ in many passages of the Old Testament; though in a different way from Cocceius, that is, not in the *words*, but in the things and the persons.

² These are expressly refuted by the learned Daniel Whitby, in his *Dissertatio de Scripturarum Interpretatione secundum Patrum Commentarios*, London, 1714, 8vo. [Whitby has here collected the absurd and whimsical expositions of the fathers, and placed them together in their most ridiculous attitude. See Maclaine's note, *Tr.*]

thus trammelled, but treated both doctrinal and practical theology freely, after the manner of the Arminians.

§ 9. As already observed in another place, *William Ames*, an Englishman, was the first among the Reformed who attempted to elucidate and arrange the science of morals, as distinct from that of dogmatics.¹ But he is dry, and writes more for the schools than for common life. Afterwards the Arminians (who, it appears, were much more zealous to perfect that part of theology which regulates the life and the heart, than that which informs the understanding) induced great numbers to attempt something more useful, and more popular, in this department. The French, however, and the English, excel the others in facility, acuteness, and solidity. Among the French, to mention no others, *Moses Amyraut*, a man of distinguished energy and acuteness of mind, first produced in French, though in a style now obsolete, a complete system of moral science; by which those who have more recently obtained much reputation by their writings, *John la Placette* and *Benedict Pictet*, appear to have profited not a little.² Among the English, during the immense convulsions of the civil wars, the *Presbyterians* and *Independents* especially, endeavoured by various works to make themselves useful in the cause of piety. Some of these (as the nation is naturally grave and inclined towards austerity) are too rigorous, and regardless of man's condition; while others manifestly incline towards the precepts of the mystics. When *Hobbes* subjected all religion to the sovereign will of princes, and laboured to subvert altogether the natural distinction between right and wrong, he roused up great and discerning men, *Cumberland*, *Sharrock*, *Cudworth*, and others,³ to lay open the primary sources of right and justice, and to purify them from misrepresentations; by which they contributed very much to the illustration and confirmation of Christian holiness.

§ 10. At the beginning of the century, the school of Geneva was in such reputation, throughout the Reformed world, that nearly all resorted to it, who were not prevented by the narrowness of their worldly circumstances from seeking the best education and the highest attainments in theological knowledge.⁴ Hence the opinions of *Calvin* and his pupils, respecting the divine decrees and grace, readily spread everywhere, and were introduced into all the schools. Yet there was nowhere any public ordinance or test, which denied religious

¹ [In his book *de Conscientia et ejus jure vel casibus*, libri v. Amsterd. 1630, 4to, 1640 and 1670, 12mo. It was also published in a German translation, by Geo. Phil. Harsdorfer, Nuremb. 1654. *Schl.*]

² [*Amyraut's* work, entitled *Morale Chrétienne*, was printed in 1652, 6 vols. 8vo.—*La Placette's* work was entitled *Essais de Morale, avec la suite*, Hague, 1706, 8 vols. 8vo, and was published in a German translation, Jena, 1719 and 1728.—*Pictet's* work was entitled: *La Morale Chrétienne, ou l'Art de bien vivre*, Geneva, 1710, 2 vols.

4to. This work was so satisfactory to the catholics, that the Countess of Sporck had it translated into German, omitting the passages offensive to the catholics, and printed it at her own cost, Prague, 1711. *Schl.*]

³ [See *Leland's View of the Deistical Writers*, i. 48. *MacL.*]

⁴ The high reputation which the Genevan academy once had, gradually declined, after the establishment of the Dutch republic, and the erection of the universities of Leyden, Franeker, and Utrecht.

teachers the liberty either of believing themselves, or of teaching differently from the Genevans.¹ Hence there were many persons to be found in all quarters who either dissented altogether from the Genevans,² or somehow put a qualification upon their doctrine. And even those who took the side of the Genevans had some dissension among themselves. For while most of them supposed, that God only *permitted* the first man to sin, but did not *decree* his apostasy, others went further, and were so daring as to maintain, that God from all eternity, in order to place his justice and his free goodness in the clearest light, had decreed the lamentable transgression of Adam; and had so disposed everything, that our first parents could not avoid or escape the transgression. The latter were called *Supralapsarians*, in distinction from the former, who were called *Infra-lapsarians*.

§ 11. Disregarding the points in which they differed, as being of small moment, both laboured with united strength to put down those, who maintained, that God is most graciously disposed towards all mankind. Hence a great schism arose, soon after the commencement of the century, which never could be healed. *James Arminius*, professor of theology at Leyden, rejected the Genevan doctrines, and embraced the Lutheran doctrine concerning grace, which excludes no one absolutely from eternal salvation. He was joined by many persons in Holland, who were distinguished both for learning and the stations they filled. On the other hand, he was most strenuously opposed by *Francis Gomarus*, his colleague, and by the principal teachers in the universities. The rulers of the commonwealth recommended moderation; and saw no reason why both opinions might not be taught in a free state, without injury to religion. After long altercation and violent contests, by order of *Maurice*, prince of Orange,³ this controversy was submitted to the judgment of the

¹ Besides Hugo Grotius, who evinces this in his *Apologeticus*, already mentioned, see Theodore Volckh. Coornhart, a Hollander, well known by the controversies he produced, in his Dutch tracts written near the close of the [preceding] century, in which he assails the doctrine of absolute decrees. I have now before me, his *Dolingen des Catechismi ende der Predicanten*, Utrecht, 1590, 8vo. *Van de toelatinghe ende decreete Godes Bedenkinghe, of de Heylighe Schrift als Johan Calvin ende Beza daerran leeren*, Altena, 1572, 8vo. *Orsacken ende middelen van der Menschen saligheid ende Verdoenisse*, 1603, 8vo. Of this man, Godf. Arnold treats, in the second volume of his *Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*, in several places. [Especially pt. iii. ch. vi. vol. ii. p. 377, &c. ed. 1741, where his life and controversies are stated at length. *Tr.*—James Arminius, while a minister at Amsterdam, being directed by the Consistory to refute the writings of Coornhart, was converted to his doctrines, by the perusal of

his writings, and therefore defended them against the Reformed. *Schl.*]

² [e. gr. Henry Bullinger, a famous divine at Zurich, who clearly declared in favour of universal grace. See Jo. Alphon. Turretin's Letter to W. Wake, abp. of Canterbury, in the *Bibliothèque Germanique*, t. xiii. art. ii. p. 92, &c. and Herm. Hildebrand's *Orthodoxa Declaratio Articulorum Trium*, p. 295, &c. and even in Holland, at the establishment of the university of Leyden, John Holmann, a universalist, was appointed first professor of theology. See Gerhard Brandt's *History of the Reformation in the Netherlands*, book ix, and the *Histoire Abrégée de la Réformation de Brandt*, i. 229, &c. *Schl.*]

³ ['It was not by the authority of prince Maurice, but by that of the States-general, that the national synod was assembled at Dort. The States were not, indeed, unanimous; three of the seven provinces protested against the holding of the synod, viz. Holland, Utrecht, and Overijssel.' *Macl.*]

whole church, and discussed in a council held at Dort, in 1618. There were present in the council, besides the best theologians of Holland, representatives of the English, the Palatines, the Swiss, the Bremsians, and the Hessians. Before this tribunal the Arminians lost their cause, and were pronounced corruptors of the true religion; and those among the Genevans, who are called *Infralapsarians*, triumphed. The *Supralapsarian* party, indeed, had supporters and advocates, who were neither few nor inactive; but the moderation and gentleness especially of the English divines, prevented their doctrines from obtaining the sanction of the Synod. The *Infralapsarians* also would not have obtained all they wished for [against the Arminians] if things could have gone according to the wishes of the Bremsian divines; who, for weighty reasons, did not choose to be at variance with the Lutherans.¹

§ 12. Whether this victory over the Arminians, on the whole, was advantageous or detrimental to the doctrinal views of the Genevans, and to the Reformed church, may be justly questioned. This is most certain, that after the times of the council of Dort, the doctrine of absolute decrees began to decline, and to sink more and more; and stern necessity obliged its defenders to recognise as brethren, those who either openly coincided with the Arminians, or at least bore a near resemblance to them. The Arminians, who were at first condemned, and whose leaders were men of great eloquence, and of superior genius as well as learning, being irritated by banishments, legal penalties, and various other injuries, attacked their foes with so much vigour and eloquence, that vast numbers became persuaded of the justice of their cause. Among the Dutch themselves, the provinces of Friesland, Zealand, Utrecht, Gröningen, and Guelderland, could not be persuaded to receive the decrees of the synod of Dort. And though, after the lapse of many years, in 1651, these provinces were at length prevailed upon to declare their pleasure, that the Reformed religion, as it was settled at Dort, should be maintained and defended, yet the greatest jurists among the Dutch maintain, that this decision cannot have the force of a real and absolute law.² England, through the influence especially of *William Laud*, went over to the side of the Arminians, immediately after the synod of Dort; and quite to our times, it has not so much neglected, as actually despised and contemned, the decisions of that council.³ And this was almost a necessary occurrence, since the English wished to conform their church to the institutions, opinions, and rules of the first centuries; and the *Fathers*, as they are called, before *Augustine*, assigned no limitation to the grace and good will of God. The French,

¹ The writers of these transactions will be mentioned below, in the chapter on the Arminians.

² See the illustrious Conrad von Bynckershoeck's *Questionum Juris publici Libri duo*, Leyden, 1737 4to, lib. ii. cap. xviii.

³ Sever. Lintrup's *Dissert. de Contemptu Concilii Dordrac. in Angliā*; in the *Diss. Theologicae* of Heet. Godf. Masius, t. i. no. 19. [See King James's Injunctions to the bishops, A. D. 1622, in Neal's *History of the Puritans*, vol. ii. ch. ii. p. 153. Tr.

although at first they seemed to favour the decisions at Dort, yet soon afterwards, because those decisions were highly offensive to the papists among whom they lived, began to think and to teach very differently from them. Among the Germans, neither the churches of Brandenburg, nor those of Bremen, would suffer their teachers to be tied down to the opinions of the Dutch. Hence the liberty of free thought respecting grace and predestination, which seemed to be wholly extinguished and suppressed at Dort, rather acquired life and activity from the transactions there; and the Reformed church soon became divided into *Universalists* and *Semi-Universalists*, *Supralapsarians* and *Infralapsarians*;¹ who, though they dislike each other, and sometimes get into contention, yet are prevented, by various causes, from attacking and overpowering one another by open war. It should not be forgotten, that we have in our own times seen Geneva itself, the parent, nurse, and guardian of the doctrine of *absolute decrees and particular grace*, not only become kind and gentle towards the Arminians, but also herself almost Arminian.

§ 13. The French church, while it remained inviolate, thought proper to deviate in many particulars from the common rule of the Reformed; being influenced, as appears from many proofs, principally by this one reason, namely, that it might, by some means, be relieved from a part of the hatred under which it laboured, and from that load of odious consequences which the papists charged upon the Genevan doctrines. Hence the books of the theologians of Sedan and Saumur, which were composed after the synod of Dort, contain many things quite similar and akin not only to the Lutheran sentiments concerning grace, predestination, the person of Christ, and the efficacy of the sacraments, but also to some opinions of the Romanists. The commencement of this moderation may be traced back, I think, to the year 1615, when the opinion of *John Piscator*, a divine of Herborn, respecting the obedience of Christ, was tacitly received, or at least pronounced void of error,² in the council of the Isle of France, not-

¹ [Universalists are those among the Reformed, who teach the universal grace of God towards all apostate men; and consequently, also, a universal atonement, and a call to all men. They are, however, divided into two classes. Some ascribe to the means of grace which God affords, sufficient power to enlighten and sanctify all men; and teach, that it depends on the voluntary conduct of men, whether the grace of God shall produce its effects on them or not. These, who are sometimes called absolute (unconditional) Universalists, are by Mosheim denominated simply Universalists. Others maintain, that God indeed wishes to make all men happy, but only on the condition of their believing: and that this faith originates from the sovereign and irresistible operation of God, or from the free, unconditional, and sovereign election of God. These, who are sometimes called

hypothetical (conditional) universalists, and who scarcely differ, except in words, from the Infralapsarians, are by Mosheim denominated Semi-universalists. The Supralapsarians, to which class belonged Beza, Francis Gomarus, and Gisbert Voetius, not only teach unconditional election, but they place this election *anterior* to the purpose of God to create men, and their apostasy. The Infralapsarians, on the contrary, make this unconditional election to be *subsequent* to the foreseen apostasy. Both these last are also called [in distinction from the Universalists] Particularists. But it is to be hoped, that when sound interpretations shall become prevalent in the Reformed churches, these parties, which are the unhappy offspring of a disputatious spirit and of ignorance of the original languages, will at length entirely cease. *Schl.*]

² Jo. Aymon, *Actes de tous les Synodes*

withstanding that it had before been rejected and exploded in other French councils.¹ *Piscator* was of opinion that our Saviour did not satisfy the divine law in our stead by His *obedience*; but that He, as a man, was bound to obey the Divine will, and therefore could not, by keeping the law, merit anything with God for others. It will be easy for those who understand the papal doctrines to see how much aid this opinion affords to the papists, in confirming the sentiments which they commonly inculcate respecting the merit of good works, man's power to obey the law, and other points.² This small beginning was followed by other far more important steps; among which some were so much out of the way, that the most modest, and the most averse from contention, among the French themselves, could not approve them.

§ 14. The divines of Saumur, first *John Cameron*, and then *Moses Amyraut*, a man distinguished for clear-sightedness and erudition, devised a method of uniting the doctrines of the Genevans respecting the divine decrees, as expounded at Dort, with the views of those who hold that the love of God embraces the whole human race. And *Amyraut*, from about the year 1634, pursued this most difficult of all objects with so much zeal and with so great vigour of genius, that, to gain his point, he changed a great part of the received system of theology. His plan, which was too extensive to be here fully detailed, was substantially this: that God wishes the salvation of all men whatever; and that no mortal is excluded from the benefits of *Christ* by any divine decree: but that no one can become a partaker, either of the benefits of *Christ* or of salvation, unless he believes in *Christ*. And that God, in His boundless goodness, has withheld from no one

Nationaux des Eglises Réformées de France, ii. 275, 276.

¹ See Aymon, *l. c.* i. 301, 400, 457, ii. 13. Jac. Benign. Bossuet, *Hist. des Variations des Eglises Protestantes*, l. xiii. t. ii. p. 268. To Bossuet thus tauntingly reproaching, as is his custom, the changeableness of the Reformed, Jac. Basnage appears to have replied, not solidly, in his *Histoire de l'Eglise*, ii. 1533, &c. [There manifestly was some change in the views of the French divines, in regard to *Piscator's* sentiments; for they repeatedly and expressly condemned them in several of their synods, and afterwards yielded up the point. Hence Basnage could not deny the fact. But was this change of opinion any way reproachful to the French clergy? Bossuet thought it was: but candid men will judge otherwise. *Tr.*]

² [Maclaine is much offended with Mosheim, for intimating that *Piscator's* opinions afforded support to the popish doctrines of the merit of good works, man's ability to obey the law, &c. And, indeed, it is difficult to see the connexion supposed by Mosheim. It is also true, as Maclaine states, that *Piscator's* doctrine, by denying

that even *Christ* himself could perform any works of supererogation, cut up by the roots the popish doctrine, that a vast number of common saints have performed such works, and thus have filled that spiritual treasury, from which the pontiffs can dispense pardons and indulgence to an almost unlimited extent.—*Piscator* held that *Christ* redeemed us, only by his *death*, or by his *sufferings*; and not, as was then generally held, by both his *active* and his *passive* obedience. His arguments were, that *Christ*, as being a man, was bound to obey the will of God perfectly; so that he could not *do* more than he was under personal obligation to perform. Moreover, that if *Christ* had perfectly *obeyed* the law in *man's* stead, then men would not be under obligation to obey it themselves: because it would be unjust in God to require obedience *twice over*, once from our representative, and then again from us. Besides, if *Christ*, in our stead, both obeyed the law, and suffered the penalty of its violation, then the law had been *doubly satisfied*; or God had received the obedience he required, and yet inflicted the penalty for disobedience. *Tr.*]

the power or ability to believe: but He by no means assists all to use this power so as to obtain salvation. Hence it is that so many thousands of men perish, through their own fault, and not by the fault of God.¹ Those who embraced this scheme were called *Hypothetical Universalists*; because they believed that God has compassion indeed towards all, yet only on the condition that they believe in *Christ*. It is the opinion of many, that this doctrine does not differ from that maintained at Dort, otherwise than as the naked club of *Hercules* differs from itself when painted and adorned with ribbons; which is but little difference after all. I doubt, however, whether such persons have duly considered either the principles from which it springs, or the consequences to which it leads. After considering and reconsidering it, it appears to me to be *Arminianism*, or, if you please, *Pelagianism*, artificially dressed up and veiled in ambiguous terms; and in this opinion I feel myself greatly confirmed when I look at the more recent disciples of *Amyraut*, who express their views more clearly and more boldly than their master.² The author of this doctrine was first attacked by some councils of the French [Protestants]; but when they had examined the cause, they acquitted and dismissed him.³ With greater violence he was assailed by the celebrated Dutch divines, *Andrew Rivet*, *Frederic Spanheim*, *Samuel des Marets* (*Maresius*), and others; to whom *Amyraut* himself, and afterwards the leading French divines, *John Daillé* (*Dallaus*), *David Blondel*, and others, made energetic replies.⁴ The vehement and long protracted contest was productive of very little effect. For the opinions of *Amyraut* infected not only the Huguenot universities in France, and nearly all the principal doctors, but also spread first to Geneva, and then, with the French exiles, through all the Reformed churches. Nor is there any one at the present day who ventures to speak against it.

§ 15. From the same desire of softening certain Reformed doctrines, which afforded to the papists as well as the others much occasion for reproach, originated *Joshua Placeus*' (de la Place's) opinion concerning the *imputation* of the sin committed by the parents of the human race. This theologian of Saumur, the colleague and intimate friend of *Amyraut*, in the year 1640, denied the doctrine, then generally inculcated in the Reformed schools, that the sin of the first man was *imputed* to his posterity; and maintained, on the contrary, that each person's own inherent defilement and dispo-

¹ See Jo. Wolff. Jaeger's *Historia Eccles. et Politica*, sæc. xvii. decenn. iv. p. 522, &c.

² [Schlegel expresses much regret that Mosheim neither here nor in his lectures, more clearly showed how a disguised Pelagianism lies concealed under this scheme of the Hypothetical Universalists. And he refers us to his notes on cent. v. pt. ii. chap. v. § 23 and 26, to show that this scheme of Amyraut was not in reality Pelagianism, nor even Semi-Pelagianism. *Tr.*]

³ See Aymon's *Actes des Synodes Natio-*

naux des Eglises Réformées en France, ii. p. 571, &c. p. 604, &c. [Quick's *Synodicon*, ii. 352, &c. 397, &c. 455. *Tr.*] David Blondel's *Actes Authentiques des Eglises Réformées, touchant la Paix et la Charité Fraternelle*, p. 19, &c. p. 82, Amsterd. 1655, 4to.

⁴ Peter Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, t. i. art. *Amyraut*, p. 182, art. *Daillé*, t. ii. 947, &c. Art. *Blondell*, t. i. 571, &c. Christ. Matth. Pfaff, *de Formula Consensus*, c. i. p. 4, &c. and others.

sition to sin was attributed to him, by God, as his crime; or, to use the language of theologians, he contended that *original sin* was imputed to men, *not immediately, but only mediately*. This opinion was condemned as erroneous in the synod of Charenton, A.D. 1642; and was confuted by many theologians of great respectability among the Swiss and the Dutch.¹ And *De la Place*, influenced by the love of peace, did not think proper to offer any public defence of it.² But neither his silence, nor the condemnation of the synod, could prevent this doctrine from commending itself to the minds of very many of the French as being reasonable; or from spreading, through them, into other countries. In the number of those who were disposed to gratify the papists at the expense of the religion of their fathers, many have placed *Lewis Cappel*, another divine of Saumur; who, in a long and elaborate work,³ attempted to prove that the Hebrew vowel points were not inserted by the inspired writers, but were added in more recent times. This indeed is certain, that his opinion pleased the Romanists, who thought it very useful to weaken the authority of the sacred Scriptures, and depress them below the unwritten word.⁴ It was, therefore, the more earnestly and learnedly opposed by great numbers of the best Hebraists, both among the Lutherans and the Reformed.⁵

§ 16. All these divines, though they incurred much odium, yet obtained the approbation of very many, and have been pronounced unexcusable by the candour of subsequent times: but those were less fortunate, who have been already mentioned, as openly meditating a union of the French Reformed church with that subject to Roman

¹ Aymon, *Synodes des Eglises Réformées de France*, ii. 680. [Quick's *Synodicon*, ii. 473. He maintained *hereditary depravity*, which he accounted criminal, and a just ground of punishment, but denied the *imputation of Adam's sin* to his posterity. Tr. —Placcus advanced his opinion, in his *Theses Theologicae de Statu Hominis lapsi ante Gratiam*, 1640, which are inserted in the *Syntagma Thesium Theologicar. in Academia Salmuriensi disputatarum*, pt. i. p. 205, &c. He was understood by some to deny all imputation of Adam's sin. He was first brought into trouble on the subject in 1645; when Ant. Garissoles, a divine of Montauban, and others, accused him before the national synod of Charenton. Amyraut, though he adhered to the common doctrine, defended him: but his opinion was disapproved by the synod. Many censured the decision of the synod, as being hasty and unjust, because Placcus was condemned, unexcused and unheard, his opinion being misapprehended, and Garissoles his accuser being allowed to preside in the synod. Placcus himself was so cool, dispassionate, and peaceful, that he defended his assailed reputation by no public writing, but patiently waited for the meeting of a new synod,

until, at last, the unceasing outcry of his opponents, in 1655, compelled him to publish a new Disputation, *de Imputatione prima Peccati Adami*, in which he showed that the synod did not understand his doctrine; since he denied merely his *immediate* imputation of Adam's sin (an imputation arising from the sovereign decree of God), and not the *mediate* imputation, or one naturally consequent on the descent of men from Adam. Yet this explanation did not satisfy his excited opposers. Andrew Rivet, Samuel Maresius, and Francis Turretin did not cease to assail him; and by instigation of the last-named, the belief of immediate imputation was settled as an article of faith, by the church of Geneva, in 1675. See Weismann's *Historia Eccles. sæc. xvii. p. 919. Schl.*

² See Christ. Eberh. Weismann's *Hist. Eccles. sæc. xvii. p. 817.*

³ In his *Arcanum Punctuationis Revelatum*; which, with his *Vindiciæ*, may be found in his works, Amsterd. 1689, fol. and in the *Critica Sacra Vet. Test.* Paris, 1650, fol.

⁴ [Or tradition. Tr.]

⁵ See Jo. Christ. Wolf's *Bibliotheca Hebraica*, pt. ii. p. 27, &c.

sway; and likewise those who attempted so to explain or shape theology as would render the transition to the Romish party shorter and more easy. To this class belonged *Lewis le Blanc*, a divine of Sedan, and *Claude Pajon*, a minister at Orleans; both of whom were eloquent, and men of great penetration. The former, with great perspicuity, so treated various controversies which divide the protestants from the papists, as to show that some of them were mere contests about words, and that others were of much less importance than was commonly supposed.¹ Hence he is much censured to this day by those who think that great care should be taken, lest, by filing down and lessening too much the cause of disagreement, the truth should be exposed to danger.² This acute man left behind him a sect, which, however, being very odious to most persons, either conceals or very cautiously states its real sentiments.

§ 17. *Claude Pajon* appeared to explain and to adulterate that part of the Reformed religion which treats of the native depravity of man, his power to do good, the grace of God, and the conversion of the soul to God, by the principles and tenets of the Cartesian philosophy, which he had imbibed completely. But what his opinions really were, it is very difficult to determine: and whether this arises from his own endeavours to conceal what he really thought, by enunciating it under an ambiguous phraseology, or from the negligence or the malice of his adversaries, I cannot really decide. If we believe his adversaries, he was of opinion that man has more soundness and more ability to reform himself than is generally apprehended; that what is called *original sin* cleaves only to the understanding, and consists principally in want of power to view religious questions clearly and sufficiently; that this faultiness of the human understanding excites the will to evil inclinations and actions; that it is to be cured, not by the powers of nature, but by the influences of the Holy Spirit acting through the medium of the divine Word; that this word, however, does not possess any inherent divine power, or any *physical* or *hyperphysical* energy, but only a *moral* influence; that is, it reforms the human understanding in the same manner as human truth does, namely, by exhibiting clear and well-defined views of divine things, and such solid arguments as may prove the truths of Christianity to be consistent with right reason, and God's perfections; that every man, therefore, if his power were not weakened and withdrawn by either internal or external impediments, might renew his own mind by the use of his reason, and by meditation on revealed truth, without the extraordinary aid of the Holy Spirit.³

¹ In his *Theses Theologicæ*, which are well worth reading. The copy before me was printed at London, 1675, fol., but there have been several editions of them.

² See Peter Bayle, *Dictionnaire*, tom. i. article *Beaulieu*, p. 458, &c. [His whole name was Lewis le Blanc, Sieur de Beaulieu. See the notice of him above, sect. ii. pt. i. c. i. § 13, note. *Tr.*]

³ See Fred. Spanheim, *Append. ad Elenchum Controversiarum*; *Opp.* iii. 882, &c. Peter Jurieu, *Traité de la Nature et de la Grace*, p. 35, &c. Val. Ern. Loescher, *Exercit. de Claud. Pajoni ejusque Sæctator. Doctrina et Fatis*, Lips. 1692, 12mo. [Spanheim was a more candid adversary of Pajon, than Jurieu. Weismann (*l. c.* p. 942) follows Jurieu for the most part, and is too

But *Pajon* himself asserts, that he believed and professed all that is contained in the decisions of Dort, and in the other confessions and catechisms of the Reformed; complains that his opinions were misunderstood; and states, that he does not deny all *immediate operation of the Holy Spirit* on the minds of those who are converted to God, but only *that* immediate operation which is unconnected with the word of God; in other words, that he cannot agree with those who think that the Word of God is only an external and *inoperative sign* of an immediate divine operation.¹ This last proposition is manifestly ambiguous and captious. He finally adds, that we ought not to contend about the *manner* in which the Holy Spirit operates on the minds of men; that it is sufficient if a person holds this one point—that the Holy Spirit is the Author of all that is good in us. The sentiments of *Pajon*, however, were condemned not only by the Reformed divines, but also by some synods of the French church in 1677, and by a Dutch synod at Rotterdam in 1686.

§ 18. This controversy, which was in a measure settled and ended by the death of *Pajon*, was propagated in many books and discourses throughout England, Holland, and Germany, by *Isaac Papin*, a Frenchman of Blois, and son of *Pajon's* sister. Throwing off all disguise, he ventured to express himself much more coarsely and harshly than his uncle. He declared that the opinion of his uncle was this: *That man has even more power than is necessary to enable him to understand divine truth: that for the reformation and regeneration of the soul nothing more is required than to remove an unsound state of the body by medical aid, if such a state happens to exist, and then to place before the understanding, truth and error, and before the will, virtue and vice, clearly and distinctly, with their appropriate arguments.* This, and the other opinions of *Papin*, the celebrated divine of Rotterdam, *Peter Jurieu*, among others, confuted with uncommon warmth, in the years 1686, 1687, and 1688. They were also condemned by the Synod of Bois-le-Duc in 1687; and still more severely by the synod at the Hague in 1688; which also ejected the man from the Reformed church. Provoked by this severity, *Papin*, who, in other things, manifested fine talents, returned to France in the year 1689, and the next year revolted to the Roman church, in which he died in 1709.² Some think him to have been treated unjustly, and that his opinions were misrepresented by his mortal adversary *Jurieu*; but how true this may be, I cannot say.

severe upon *Pajon*; who had no other aim than to guard against fanaticism and enthusiasm, and probably viewed the word of God with higher reverence than many of his opponents did. *Schl.*]

¹ See the tract which *Pajon* himself composed, and which is inserted in *Jac. Geo. de Chauffepie's Nouveau Dictionnaire Hist. et Crit. t. ii. art. Cene*, p. 164, &c.

² See *Jurieu, de la Nature et de la Grace*; and in other writings. *Jo. Möller, Cimbria*

Litterata, ii. 608, &c. and others. [According to Möller, *l. c.*, *Papin's* scheme of doctrine grew out of his Cartesian philosophy. He supposed that in creating the world, God so formed and constituted all things, that he never has occasion to interpose his immediate agency, unless when a miracle is necessary. Of course, that the conversion of sinners is brought about, as all other events are, by the operation of natural causes. *Tr.*]

A defence of the Paionian sentiment was likewise attempted, in 1684, in several tracts, by *Charles le Cene*; a French divine of a vigorous mind, who has given us a French translation of the Bible.¹ But as he entirely discarded and denied the natural depravity of man, and taught that we can amend ourselves by our own power, by attentively listening to divine truth, especially if we have also a good education, good examples, and some other advantages, there are those who contend, that his scheme of doctrine differs, in many respects, from that of *Pajon*.²

§ 19. The English church was agitated with most violent storms and tempests. When *James I.*, king of Scotland, on the death of *Elizabeth*, ascended the throne of England, the *Puritans*, or friends of the Genevan discipline, indulged no little hope that their condition would be meliorated, and that they should no longer be exposed to the continual wrongs of the *Episcopalians*. For the king had been born and educated among the Scotch, who were *Puritans*.³ And his first movements corresponded well with these expectations, and seemed to announce that he would use the royal authority to assume the character of mediator between the disagreeing parties.⁴ But, on

¹ It was published after the author's death, Amsterd. 1741, fol., and was condemned by the Dutch synods.

² See the *Nouveau Dictionnaire Histor. et Crit.* article *Cene*, t. ii. 160, &c.

³ See cent. xvi. sect. iii. pt. ii. c. iv. § 25.

⁴ [King James professed himself attached to the Church of Scotland, until his removal to England in April, 1603. While on his journey, all religious parties in England made their court to him. To the Dutch and French protestants settled in the country, he gave favourable answers. The bishops negotiated with him by their envoys. The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge addressed him in behalf of the establishment; and the Puritans presented their petition in favour of a reform of the church. One petition of the latter, signed by about 800 Puritan ministers, was called the *Millenary Petition*, from the signatures to it—almost a thousand. In October, 1603, the king appointed a conference at Hampton Court, to be held the January following, between the Episcopalians and the Puritans, with a view to settle the controversies between them. On the side of the Episcopalians were nine bishops, and about as many dignitaries of the church; and on the part of the Puritans were four English divines, and one from Scotland; all of whom were selected by the king himself. On the first day of the conference, Jan. 14, 1604, the Episcopalians alone were admitted to the royal presence: and the king made some few objections to the English ritual and discipline, which the bishops either vindicated or consented to modify. The second

day, Jan. 16th, the Puritans were admitted, and proceeded to state their wishes. But the king treated them harshly, and allowed the Episcopalians to browbeat them. The bishops had a complete triumph: and Bancroft, falling on his knees, said: 'I protest, my heart melteth for joy, that Almighty God, of his singular mercy, has given us such a king, as since Christ's time has not been.' On the third day, Jan. 18th, the bishops and deans were first called in, to settle with the king what alterations should be made in the regulations of the church. Archbishop Whitgift was so elated to hear the king's approval of the law for the oath *ex officio*, that he exclaimed: 'Undoubtedly, your majesty speaks by the special assistance of God's Spirit.' After this, the Puritans were called in, not to discuss the points in controversy, but merely to hear what had been agreed upon by the king and the bishops. Thus ended this mock conference; in which the king showed himself exceedingly vain and insolent towards the Puritans, and wholly on the side of the Episcopalians. The next month, a proclamation was issued, giving an account of the conference, and requiring conformity to the liturgy and ceremonies. See Neal's *History of the Puritans*, vol. ii. ch. i. p. 30, &c. and the authors there referred to: also Johnson Grant's *History of the English Church and the Sects*, &c. vol. ii. ch. ix. p. 52, &c. *Tr.*—The reason why Episcopalians only were admitted to confer on the first day, is obvious and fair enough. They were to be confronted with opponents who demanded concessions of them. It would save time

a sudden, everything assumed a different aspect. King *James*, who was eager to grasp supreme and unlimited power, at once judged that the *Presbyterian* form of church government was adverse to his designs, and the *Episcopal* favourable to them; because *Presbyterian* churches form a kind of republic, which is subject to a number of leading men, all possessing equal rank and power; while *Episcopal* churches more nearly resemble a monarchy. The very name of a *republic*, *synod*, or *council* was odious to the king; and he therefore studied most earnestly to increase the power of the bishops; and publicly declared that, without bishops, the throne could not be safe.¹ At the same time he long wished to preserve inviolate the Genevan doctrines, especially those relating to divine grace and predestination; and he allowed the opposite doctrines of *Arminius* to be condemned by his theologians at the synod of Dort. This disposition of the king was studiously cherished, so long as he had power, by *George Abbot*, archbishop of Canterbury, a man of great weight and character, who was himself devoted to Calvinistic sentiments, and a great friend to English liberty, and whose gentleness towards their predecessors the modern *Puritans* highly extol.² But the English envoys had scarcely returned from Holland and made known the decisions of Dort, when the king, with the majority of the clergy, showed himself most averse from those decisions, and manifested a decided preference for the Arminian doctrine respecting the divine decrees.³ That there were various causes for this unexpected change

and irritation if any concessions could be offered to the other party at once. In the end some concessions were made, though none of any great importance; but then, the demands, except that for enforcing subscription to the Lambeth Articles, were objects of no great importance. As for this Lambeth subscription, it would have narrowed the terms of national conformity in a degree highly unjust and impolitic. The defeat of the Puritans, indeed, if defeat it could be called, in this *mock conference*, as their admirers term it, was the defeat of narrow-minded, arrogant intolerance and scrupulosity. Undoubtedly, both Abp. Whitgift and Bp. Bancroft disgraced themselves by falling into a sycophancy closely bordering upon blasphemy; but it should be stated, as some extenuation of their most reprehensible folly, that it did not occur until lay courtiers had set the example, and that the English hierarchy had come to the conference under some misgivings as to the effect of James's Presbyterian education. Those who wish for an accurate and full account of these matters, must consult *The Summe and Substance of the Conference, which it pleased his Excellent Majestie to have with the Lords, Bishops, and other of his Clergie (at which most of the Lordes of the Councell were present) in his Majesties Privy-Chamber, at Hampton Court, January*

14, 1603. Barlow, the author, was then dean of Chester. He was afterwards successively bishop of Rochester and Lincoln. His work may be considered as official, having been undertaken by the desire of Abp. Whitgift. Although it contains the wretched flatteries by which both that aged primate and Bancroft have permanently injured their reputations, it exposes the mixture of frivolity and intolerance, which characterised the Puritanical expectations, in such a manner as to offend sectarians, and they have accordingly taxed it with partiality. *S.*

¹ [It was a maxim with him, and one which he repeated at the Hampton Court conference: *No bishop, no king.* See Neal, *l. c.* *Tr.*]

² See Ant. Wood's *Athenæ Oxonienses*, i. 583. Dan. Neal's *History of the Puritans*, vol. ii. ch. iv. p. 242. [ed. Boston, 1817, p. 111, 258, &c. and the long note of Maclaine on the text. *Tr.*] Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*, i. 114, &c.

³ Peter Heylin's *History of the Five Articles*, p. 444, &c. in the Dutch translation of Gerh. Brandt. Dan. Neal's *History of the Puritans*, vol. ii. ch. ii. p. 117, &c. [ed. Boston, 1817, p. 135. *Tr.*] Neal tells us, that the council of Dort was ridiculed, in England, by the following verses, among other things:—

will readily be believed by those acquainted with the history of those times; yet the principal cause, I apprehend, is to be sought in that rule for ecclesiastical reformation which the founders of the new English church kept in sight. For they wished to render their church as similar as possible to that which flourished in the first centuries; and that church, as no one can deny, was an entire stranger to the doctrines of Dort.¹ The king becoming alienated from the Calvinistic opinions and customs, the old hatred against the *Puritans*, which had somewhat subsided, again revived; and at last it broke out in open war. In short, *James I.* died, in 1625, a mortal enemy of the *Puritan* faith, which he had imbibed in his youth; a decided patron and supporter of the *Arminians*, whose condemnation he had greatly promoted; and a very strenuous assertor of *episcopal* government; and he left both the church and the commonwealth in a state of fluctuation, and languishing with intestine maladies.

§ 20. *Charles I.*, the son of *James I.*, determined to perfect what his father had undertaken. He, therefore, used every effort, first, to extend the regal power, and to exalt it above the authority of the laws; secondly, to subject the whole church of Great Britain and

‘Dordrecht Synodus, Nodus: Chorus integer, Æger:

Conventus, Ventus: Sessio, Stramen: Amen.’

Moreover, for ascertaining the character and conduct of king *James*, and his inconstancy in religion, much aid is afforded by the writers of English history, and especially by *Larrey* and *Rapin-Thoyras*. Most of these state, that in his last years, *James* greatly favoured not only the *Arminians*, but also the papists; and they tell us, there can be no doubt, the king wished to unite the English church with that of Rome. But in this, I apprehend, the king is too severely accused; although I do not deny, that he did many things not to be commended. It is not easy to believe, that a king who aspired immoderately after supreme and absolute sway, should wish to create to himself a lord, in the Roman pontiff. [Yet see the following note. *Tr.*] But, at length, he inclined more towards the Roman church, than formerly; and he permitted some things, which were coincident with the Roman rites and regulations; because he was persuaded, that the ancient Christian church was the exemplar, after which all churches should copy; that a religious community would be the more holy and the more perfect, the nearer its resemblance to the divine and apostolic standard; and that the Roman church retained more of the first and primitive form, than the *Puritan* or Calvinistic church did.

¹ Perhaps also the king was influenced by the recollection of the civil commotions, formerly excited in Scotland, on account of

the *Presbyterian* religion. There are some circumstances, likewise, which indicate that the king, even before he came into England, was not wholly averse from the Romish religion. See the *Bibliothèque Raisonnée*, xliii. 318, &c. [‘Thus far the note of our author: and whoever looks into the *Historical View of the Negotiations between the Courts of England, France, and Brussels, from the year 1592 to 1617*, extracted from the MS. State Papers of Sir Thomas Edmondes and Anthony Bacon, Esq., and published in 1749, by the learned and judicious Dr. Birch, will be persuaded that towards 1595, this fickle and unsteady prince had really formed a design to embrace the faith of Rome. See, in the curious collection now mentioned, the *Postscript* of a Letter from Sir Thomas Edmondes to the Lord High-Treasurer, dated the 20th of December, 1595. We learn also from the *Memoirs of Ralph Winwood*, that in 1596, *James* sent Mr. Ogilby, a Scots baron, into Spain, to assure his catholic majesty, that he was then ready and resolved to embrace popery, and to propose an alliance with that king and the pope against the queen of England. See *State Tracts*, i. 1. See also an extract of a letter from Tobie Matthew, D.D., dean of Durham, to the lord treasurer Burleigh, containing an information of Scotch affairs, in *Strype’s Annals*, iv. 201. Above all, see *Harris’s Historical and Critical Account of the Life and Writings of James I.*, p. 29, note (N). This last writer may be added to *Larrey* and *Rapin*, who have exposed the pliability and inconsistency of this self-sufficient monarch.’ *Macl.*]

Ireland to the episcopal form of government, which he considered as of divine appointment, and as affording the best security to the civil sovereign: and thirdly, to reduce the whole religion of the country to the pattern and form of the primitive church, rejecting all the doctrines and institutions of the Genevans. The execution of these designs was principally intrusted to *William Laud*, then bishop of London, and afterwards, from A.D. 1633, archbishop of Canterbury; who was in many respects, undoubtedly, a man of eminence, being a very liberal patron of learning and learned men, resolute, ingenuous, and erudite; but, at the same time, too furious, headlong, and inconsiderate, inclined to superstition, and also bigotedly attached to the opinions, rites, and practices of the ancient Christians, and therefore a mortal enemy of the *Puritans* and of all Calvinists.¹ He prosecuted the objects of the king's wishes as well as his own, without any moderation; often disregarded and trampled upon the laws of the land; persecuted the Puritans most rigorously, and eagerly strove to extirpate them altogether; rejecting Calvinistic views, in relation to predestination and other points, he, after the year 1625, contrary to the wishes of *George Abbot*, substituted Arminian sentiments in the place of them;² restored many ceremonies and rites, which were indeed ancient, but at the same time superstitious, and on that ground previously abrogated; obtruded bishops upon the Scottish nation, which was accustomed to the Genevan discipline, and extremely

¹ See Ant. Wood's *Athenæ Oxoniens.* ii. 55, &c. Peter Heylin's *Cyprianus Anglicanus*, or the *History of the Life and Death of William Laud*; Lond. 1668, fol. Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion and the Civil Wars in England*, vol. i. [Neal's *History of the Puritans*, vol. ii. chap. iv. &c. and vol. iii. chap. v. Tr.]

² See Mich. le Vassor's *Hist. de Louis XIII.* v. 262, &c. [Laud was then bishop of London, though in effect at the head of the established church. Legally, neither he, nor any prelate, nor even the king, could abrogate or enact articles of faith, without the consent of parliament. Nor was any such thing attempted. But the king, at the instigation (it is stated) of bishop Laud, issued a proclamation, June 14, 1626, which sets forth, 'That the king will admit of no innovation in the doctrine, discipline, or government of the church, and therefore charges all his subjects, and especially the clergy, not to publish or maintain, in preaching or writing, any new inventions or opinions, contrary to the said doctrine and discipline established by law.' This apparently harmless proclamation was, of course, to be executed by Laud and his associates; and Laud was publicly accused of using it to punish and put down Calvinists, and to prevent their books from being printed and circulated, while Arminians were allowed to preach, and to print *their* sentiments most

fully. See Neal's *History of the Puritans*, vol. ii. chap. iii. p. 122, &c. and vol. iii. ch. v. p. 222, &c. ed. Boston, 1817, and Mac-laine's note (m) on this paragraph. Tr.—The following circumstances gave rise to the proclamation mentioned in this note. Richard Montague, rector of Stanford Rivers, in Essex, a divine of superior acquirements, found some Romish priests active in his parish. He left, in consequence, certain queries at a house which they frequented, adding that a satisfactory answer would make a Romish convert of himself. For a time no notice was taken, but at length he received a short pamphlet, entitled *A New Gag for the Old Gospel*. In this piece, the Church of England was saddled with the Calvinistic decisions of the synod of Dort, and other favourite Puritanical speculations. In his answer, and another piece that soon followed it, and was connected with it, he disclaimed all these principles. A violent ferment quickly arose, and the House of Commons, which had become a hotbed of Puritanical politics, commenced a furious persecution of Montague, charging him with popery and Arminianism. Several writers took the same view, and it was to silence this controversy, which was beginning to convulse the kingdom, that Charles issued the proclamation partially cited in this note. Collier, ii. 729, 734, 738. S.]

averse from episcopacy; and not obscurely showed, that, in his view, the Roman church, though erroneous, was a holier and better church than those protestant sects which had no bishops. Having, by these acts, excited immense odium against the king and himself, and the whole order of bishops, he was arraigned by the parliament in 1644, judged guilty of betraying the liberties and the religion of the country, and beheaded.¹ After the execution of *Laud*, the civil conflict, which had long existed between the king and the parliament, attained such a height, that it could be extinguished by nothing short of the life-blood of this excellent prince. The parliament, inflamed by the *Puritans*, or by the *Presbyterians* and *Independents*, wholly abolished the old form of church government by bishops, and whatever else, in doctrine, discipline, or worship, was contrary to the principles of the Genevans; furiously assailed the king himself, and caused him, when taken prisoner, to be tried for his life, and, to the astonishment of all Europe, to be put to death, in the year 1648. Such are the evils resulting from zeal in religion, when it is ill understood, and is placed in external regulations and forms. Moreover, as is often found true, it appeared in these scenes of commotion, that almost all sects, while oppressed, plead earnestly for charity and moderation towards dissenters; but when elevated to power, they forget their own former precepts. For the *Puritans*, when they had dominion, were no more indulgent to the bishops and their patrons than these had formerly been to them.²

§ 21. The *Independents*, who have been just mentioned among the promoters of civil discord, are represented by most of the English historians as more odious and unreasonable than even the *Presby-*

¹ [Archbishop Laud was impeached by the House of Commons, and tried before the House of Lords. In 1641, fourteen articles of impeachment were filed, and Laud was committed to prison. In 1644, ten additional articles were brought forward, and the trial now commenced. All the articles may be reduced to three general heads. I. That he had traitorously attempted to *subvert the rights of parliament, and to exalt the king's power above law*. II. That he had traitorously endeavoured to *subvert the constitution and fundamental laws of the land*, and to introduce arbitrary government, against law and the liberties of the subjects. III. That he had traitorously endeavoured and practised to subvert the true religion established by law, and to introduce popish superstition and idolatry. Under this last head the specifications were, *first*, that he introduced and practised popish innovations and superstitious ceremonies, not warranted by law; such as images and pictures in the churches, popish consecration of churches, converting the communion-tables into altars, bowing before the altars, &c., and, *secondly*, that he endeavoured to subvert the protes-

tant religion, and encouraged Arminianism and popery; by patronising and advancing clergymen of these sentiments; by prohibiting the publication of orthodox books, and allowing corrupt ones free circulation; by persecuting, in the high commission court, such as preached against Arminianism and popery; and by taking some direct steps towards a union with the church of Rome. The House of Lords deemed all the articles proved; but doubted, for a time, whether they amounted to treason. See the whole trial of Laud, in Neal's *Hist. of the Puritans*, vol. iii. ch. v. p. 184—255. Tr.—Hallam (*Constitutional Hist.* ii. 167), while severely blaming Laud, declares that his execution was a far more unjustifiable instance of tyrannical abuse of power, than any that was alleged against him. *Ed.*]

² Besides lord Clarendon, and the historians of England already mentioned, Daniel Neal has professedly treated of these events, in the second and third volumes of his *History of the Puritans*. [Compare also Johnson Grant's *History of the English Church and Sects*, vol. ii. ch. x. xi. p. 127—303. Tr.]

terians or Calvinists, and are commonly charged with various enormities and crimes, and indeed with the parricide committed upon *Charles I.* But I apprehend, that whoever shall candidly read and consider the books and the confessions of the sect, will cheerfully acknowledge, that many crimes are unjustly charged upon them; and that probably the misconduct of the *civil Independents* (that is, of those hostile to the regal power, and who strove after extravagant liberty) has been incautiously charged upon the *religious Independents*.¹ They derived their name from the fact, that they believed,

¹ The sect of the *Independents*, though a modern one, and still existing among the English, is, however, less known than almost any Christian sect; and on no one are more marks of infamy branded, without just cause. The best English historians heap upon it all the reproaches and slanders that can be thought of; nor is it the *Episcopalians* only who do this, but also those very *Presbyterians*, with whom they are at this day associated. They are represented, not only as delirious, crazy, fanatical, illiterate, rude, factious, and strangers to all religious truth, and to reason, but also as criminals, seditious parricides, and the sole authors of the murder of *Charles I.* John Durell (whom that most strenuous vindicator of the *Independents*, Lewis du Moulin, commends for his ingenuousness; see Ant. Wood's *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ii. 732, 733), in his *Historia Rituum Sanctæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, cap. i. p. 4, Lond. 1672, 4to, says, 'Fateor, si atrocis illius tragædiæ tot actus fuerint, quot ludicrarum essent, postremum fere Independentium fuisse.—Adeo ut non acute magis, quam vere, dixerit L'Estrangius noster: Regem primo a Presbyterianis interemptum, Carolum deinde ab Independentibus interfectum.' Foreign writers, regarding these as the best witnesses of transactions in their own country, have, of course, thought proper to follow them: and hence the *Independents* almost everywhere appear under a horrid aspect. But, as every class of men is composed of dissimilar persons, no one will deny, that in this sect also there were some persons who were turbulent, factious, wicked, flagitious, and destitute of good sense. Yet if that is also true, which all wise and good men inculcate, that the character and the principles of whole sects must be estimated, not from the conduct or words of a few individuals, but from the customs, habits, and opinions of the sect in general, from the books and discourses of its teachers, and from its public formularies and confessions; then, I am either wholly deceived, or the *Independents* are wrongfully loaded with so many criminations.

We pass over what has been so invidiously written against this sect, by Clarendon,

Laurence Echard, Samuel Parker, and many others; and to render this whole subject the more clear, we will take up only that one excellent writer, than whom, though a foreigner, no one, as the English themselves admit, has written more accurately and neatly concerning the affairs of England, namely, Rapin-Thoyras. In the twenty-first book of his immortal work, the *Histoire d'Angleterre*, viii. 535, ed. 2nd [Tindal's translation, ii. 514, fol.], he so depicts the *Independents*, that, if they were truly what he represents them, they would not deserve to enjoy the light of their land, which they still do enjoy freely, and much less to enjoy the kind offices and love of any good man. Let us look over, particularly, and briefly comment on the declarations of this great man concerning them. In the first place, he tells us, that after the utmost pains, he could not ascertain the origin of the sect: 'Quelque recherche que j'aye faite, je n'ai jamais pû découvrir exactement la première origine de la secte ou faction des Indépendans.' That a man who had spent seventeen years in composing a History of England, and consulted so many libraries filled with the rarest books, should have written thus, is very strange. If he had only looked into that very noted book, Jo. Hornbeck's *Summa Controversiarum*, lib. x. p. 775, &c. he might easily have learned what he was ignorant of, after so much research. He proceeds to the doctrines of the sect; and says of them in general, that nothing could be better suited to throw all England into confusion. 'Ce qu'il y a de certain, c'est qu'ils avoient des principes tout à fait propres à mettre l'Angleterre en combustion, comme ils le firent effectivement.' How true this declaration is, will appear from what follows. He adds, first, respecting politics, they held very pernicious sentiments. For they would not have a single man preside over the whole state; but thought that the government of the nation should be intrusted to the representatives of the people. 'Par rapport au Gouvernement de l'Etat, ils abhorroient la Monarchie, et n'approuvoient qu'un Gouvernement Républicain.' I can readily believe, that there were persons

with the *Brownists*, that individual churches are all *independent*, or subject to no foreign jurisdiction; and that they should not be com-

among the Independents unfriendly to monarchy. Such were to be found among the *Presbyterians*, the *Anabaptists*, and all the sects which then flourished in England. But I wish to see decisive testimony adduced, if it can be, to prove this the common sentiment of this whole sect. Such testimony is in vain sought for, in their public writings. On the contrary, in 1647, they publicly declared, 'that they do not disapprove of any form of civil government, but do freely acknowledge, that a kingly government, bounded by just and wholesome laws, is both allowed by God, and a good accommodation unto men.' See Neal's *History of the Puritans*, iii. 146 [ed. Boston, 1817, p. 161]. I pass over other proofs, equally conclusive, that they did not abhor all monarchy. Their religious opinions, according to our author, were most absurd. For, if we may believe him, their sentiments were contrary to those of all other sects. 'Sur la religion, leurs principes étoient opposez à ceux de tout le reste du monde.' There are extant, in particular, two Confessions of the *Independents*; the one of those in Holland, the other of those in England. The first was drawn up by John Robinson, the founder of the sect, and was published at Leyden, 1619, 4to, entitled, *Apologia pro Exulibus Anglis, qui Brownistæ vulgo appellantur*. The latter was printed London, 1658, 4to, entitled, *A Declaration of the faith and order owned and practised in the Congregational churches in England* [more than 100 in number, *Tr.*], agreed upon, and consented unto by their Elders and Messengers in their meeting at the Savoy, October 12, 1658. John Hornbeck translated it into Latin, in 1659, and annexed it to his Epistle to Duræus, *de Independentismo*. From both these, to say nothing of their other works, it is manifest, that, if we except the form of their church government, they differed in nothing of importance from the Calvinists or *Presbyterians*. But, to remove all doubt, let us hear the father of the Independents, Robinson himself, explaining the views of himself and his flock, in his *Apologia pro Exulibus Anglis*, p. 7, 11. 'Profitemur coram Deo et hominibus, adeo nobis convenire cum ecclesiis Reformatis Belgicis in re religionis, ut omnibus et singulis earundem ecclesiarum fidei articulis, prout habentur in Harmonia Confessionum fidei, parati simus subscribere — Ecclesias Reformatas pro veris et genuinis habemus, cum iisdem in sacris Dei communionem profitemur et quantum in nobis est colimus.' So far, therefore, were they from differing altogether from all other sects of Christians,

that, on the contrary, they agreed exactly with the greatest part of the Reformed churches. To show by an example, how absurd the religion of the *Independents* was, this eminent historian tells us, that they not only rejected all ecclesiastical government and order, but also made the business of teaching and praying in public, and explaining the Scriptures, common to all. 'Non seulement ils ne pouvoient souffrir l'épiscopat et l'hierarchie ecclésiastique'—(This is true. But it was a fault not peculiar to them, but chargeable also on the *Presbyterians*, the *Brownists*, the *Anabaptists*, and all the sects of *Nonconformists*.)—'mais ils ne vouloient pas mesme qu'il y eut des Ministres ordinaires dans l'Eglise. Ils soutenoient que chacun pouvoit prier en public, exhorter ses frères, expliquer l'Ecriture Sainte, selon les talens qu'il avoit reçus de Dieu.—Ainsi parmi eux chacun prioit, prêchoit, exhortoit, expliquoit la S. Ecriture, sans autre vocation que celle qu'il tiroit lui-même de son zèle et des talens qu'il croyoit avoir, et sans autre autorité que celle que luy donnoit l'approbation de ses auditeurs.' All this is manifestly false. The Independents employ, and have employed from the first, fixed and regular teachers: nor do they allow every one to teach, who may deem himself qualified for it. The excellent historian here confounds the *Independents* with the *Brownists*, who are well known to allow to all a right to teach. I pass over other assertions, notwithstanding they are equally open to censure. Now, if such and so great a man, after residing long among the English, pronounced so unjust a sentence upon this sect, who will not readily pardon others much his inferiors, who have loaded this sect with groundless accusations? [On all these charges, see Neal's *History of the Puritans*, vol. iii. ch. iv. p. 157, &c. ed. 1817. *Tr.*]

But *this* (some one may say) is certain, from numberless testimonies, that the *Independents* put that excellent king, Charles I., to death; and this single fact evinces the extreme impiety and depravity of the sect. I am aware, that the best and most respectable English historians charge *them* alone with this regicide. And I fully agree with them, provided we are to understand by the term *Independents*, those persons who were hostile to regal power, and attached to an extravagant kind of liberty. But if the term is used to denote the predecessors of those *Independents*, who still exist among the English, or a certain religious sect differing from the other English sects in certain religious opinions, I am not certain that their assertion is quite true. Those

pelled to obey the authority and laws, either of bishops or of councils, composed of presbyters and delegates from several churches.¹ In

who represent the *Independents*, as the sole authors of the atrocious deed committed on Charles I., must necessarily mean to say, either, that the nefarious parricides were excited to the deed by the suggestions and the doctrines of the *Independents*, or that they were all adherents to the worship and the doctrines of the *Independents*; neither of which is capable of solid proof. In the doctrines of the sect, as we may see, there was nothing which could excite any one to attempt such a crime; nor does the history of those times show, that there was any more hatred or malevolence towards Charles I. in the *Independents*, than in the *Presbyterians*. And that all those who put the king to death were *Independents*, is so far from being true, that, on the contrary, several of the best English historians, and even the edicts of Charles II. testify, that this turbulent company was mixed, and composed of persons of various religions. I can easily admit, that there were some *Independents* among them. After all, this matter will be best unravelled by the English themselves, who know better than we, in what sense the term *Independents* must be used, when it is applied to those who brought Charles I. to the block. [According to Neal, *l. c.* iii. 515, &c. 521, &c. 533, no one religious denomination is chargeable with the regicide, but only the army and the House of Commons, both of which were composed of men of various religions. Only two *Congregational* ministers approved the putting Charles to death; and the *Presbyterian* clergy in a body remonstrated against it. *Tr.*]

When I have carefully inquired for the reasons, why the *Independents* are taxed with so many crimes and enormities, three reasons especially have occurred to my mind. I. The term *Independents* is ambiguous, and not appropriated to any one class of men. For, not to mention other senses of it, the term is applied by the English to those friends of *democracy*, who wish to have the people enact their own laws, and govern themselves, and who will not suffer an individual, or several individuals, to bear rule in the state; or, to adhere to the letter of the name, who maintain, that the people ought to be *independent* of all control, except what arises from themselves. This faction, consisting in a great measure of mad fanatics, were the principal actors in that tragedy in England, the effects of which are still deplored. Hence, whatever was said or done by this faction, extravagantly or foolishly, was, I suspect, all charged upon our *Independents*; who were not indeed altogether without faults, yet were far better

than they.—II. Nearly all the English sects, which distracted the nation in the times of Charles I. and Oliver Cromwell, assumed the name of *Independents*; in order to participate in that public esteem, which the real *Independents* enjoyed on account of their upright conduct, and in order to screen themselves from reproach. This is attested among others by John Toland, in his letter to John le Clerc, inserted by the latter in his *Biblioth. Universelle et Historique*, t. xxiii. pt. ii. p. 506. 'Au commencement, tous les Sectaires se disoient *Indépendans*, parce que ces derniers étoient fort honorez du peuple à cause de leur piété.' Now, as the term was so extensively applied, who does not see, that it might easily be, that the enormities of various sects might be all charged upon the genuine *Independents*?—III. Oliver Cromwell, the usurper, gave a preference to the *Independents*, before all the other sects in his country. For he was as much afraid of the councils or *synods* of the *Presbyterians* as he was of the bishops; but in the form of church government adopted by the *Independents*, there was nothing at all which he could fear. Now, as men of like character incline to associate together, this circumstance might lead many to suppose, that the *Independents* were all of the same character with Cromwell, that is very bad people.

¹ They undoubtedly received the name of *Independents*, from their maintaining that all assemblies of Christians had the right of self-government, or were *independent*. This very term is used by John Robinson, in his exposition of this doctrine, in his *Apologia pro Exulibus Anglis*, cap. v. p. 22, where he says: 'Cœtum quemlibet particularem (recte institutum et ordinatum) esse totam, integram, et perfectam ecclesiam ex suis partibus constantem immediate et *independentem* (quoad alias ecclesias) sub ipso Christo.' And possibly from this very passage, the term *Independents*, which was before unknown, had its origin. At first the followers of Robinson did not reject this appellation: nor has it any bad or odious import, provided it is understood in their own sense of it. In England, it was entirely unknown till the year 1640. At least, in the *Ecclesiastical Canons*, enacted this year in the conventions held by the bishops at London and York, in which all the sects then existing in England are enumerated, there is no mention of the *Independents*. See the Constitutions and Canons ecclesiastical, treated upon by the archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the rest of the bishops and clergy in their several Synods, A.D. 1640, in David Wilkins's *Concilia*

this single opinion it is, especially, that they differ from the Presbyterians.¹ For whatever else they believe or teach on religious subjects, with very few exceptions, and those not of much importance, is almost throughout in accordance with the Genevan doctrines. The parent of the sect was *John Robinson*, minister of a Brownist church which was settled at Leyden, in Holland, a grave and pious man. Perceiving that the discipline, which *Robert Brown* had set up, was in some respects defective, he undertook to correct it, and give it such a form as would render it less odious than before. In two respects, particularly, are the *Independents* better than the *Brownists*: first in moderation and candour; for they did not, as *Brown* had done, execrate, and pronounce unworthy of the Christian name, the churches that had adopted a different form of government; but they admitted, that piety and true religion might flourish, where the ecclesiastical affairs were subject to the authority of *bishops*, or to the decrees of *councils*, yet still they looked upon their own form of government as possessed of divine authority, and introduced by no other than Christ's apostles. In the next place the *Independents* excelled the *Brownists*, by abolishing that liberty of teaching, which *Brown* had allowed equally to all the brethren. For they have regular teachers, elected by the whole brotherhood; and they do not allow any one to deliver discourses to the people, unless he has been previously examined and approved by the officers of the church. This sect, which began to exist in Holland in 1610, had very few adherents at first in England, and, to escape the punishment decreed against *Nonconformists*, kept itself concealed;² but on the decline of the power of the bishops in the time of *Charles I.* it took courage in the year 1640, and boldly showed itself in public. Afterwards, it soon increased so much in reputation and in numbers, that it could compete for priority, not only with the *Episcopalians*, but also with the very powerful *Presbyterians*; which must be attributed, among

Magnæ Britannię et Hibernię, iv. 548. But a little afterwards, and especially after the year 1642, this appellation is of frequent occurrence in the annals of English history. Nor did the English *Independents*, at first, refuse to be called by this name; but rather, in their Apology, published, London, 1644, 4to (Apologetical Narration of the *Independents*), they fearlessly assume this name. But afterwards, when, as we have remarked, many other sects adopted this name, and even seditious citizens, who plotted the destruction of their king, were commonly designated by it, they very solicitously deprecated the application of it to them, and called themselves *Congregational Brethren*, and their churches *Congregational Churches*.

¹ [There are two points of difference between the Presbyterians and the Independents, or Congregationalists. The first relates to the independence of individual churches, or their exemption from foreign

jurisdiction. The second relates to the location of the legislative and judicial powers of each church. The Presbyterians assign these powers to the *eldership* of the church, or to the pastor and the ruling elders assembled in a church session; but the *Independents* or *Congregationalists* confide them to a general meeting of all the male members of the church, or to the officers and the whole brotherhood assembled in a church meeting. From this latter principle it is, that the *Independents* are called *Congregationalists*. And as in modern times they admit of a connexion or confederation of sister churches, which in some measure bounds and limits the *independence* of the individual churches, they have discarded the name of *Independents*. Tr.]

² ['In 1616, Mr. Jacob, who had adopted the religious sentiments of Robinson, set up the first *Independent* or *Congregational* church in England.' Maccl.]

other causes, to the erudition of its teachers, and to the reformed morals of the people.¹ During the reign of *Cromwell*, who for various reasons was its greatest patron, it was everywhere in the highest reputation: but on the restoration of the English affairs, under *Charles II.*, it began to decline greatly, and gradually sank into its former obscurity. At the present day, it exists indeed, but is timid and depressed; and in the reign of *William III.*, A. D. 1691, it was induced, by its weakness, to enter into a coalition (yet without giving up its own regulations) with the Presbyterians resident in London and the vicinity.²

¹ Dan. Neal, *History of the Puritans*, ii. 107, 391, 393, iii. 141, 145, 276, 303, 537, 549. Anth. Wm. Böhm's *Englische Reformations-historie*, book vi. ch. iv. p. 794. [A part of Mr. Robinson's congregation at Leyden, removed to Plymouth in New England, in 1620. And during the reign of Charles I. and quite down to the end of the century, great numbers of the English Independents removed to New England, and there formed flourishing colonies: so that New England, for about two centuries, has contained more Independents or Congregationalists, than Old England. *Tr.*]

² From this time onward, they were called *United Brethren*. See Jo. Toland's letter, in Jo. le Clerc's *Biblioth. Universelle et Historique*, xxiii. 506. [It must not be supposed, that the distinction between *Presbyterians* and *Congregationalists* ceased in England from 1691, or that both have, ever since, formed but one sect. They still exist as distinct, yet friendly sects. Being agreed in doctrines, and anxious to hold communion with each other, notwithstanding their different modes of church government, they adopted these articles of agreement and consent; in which each sect endeavoured to come as near to the other as their different principles would admit. Moreover, these Articles, with very slight alterations, were adopted by the Elders and Messengers of the churches of Connecticut, assembled at Saybrook in 1708; and they now form a part of what is called the Saybrook Platform, or the ancient ecclesiastical constitution of Connecticut. See Trumbull's *History of Connecticut*, i. 510, 513, 514. The Articles themselves may be seen in Toulmin's *History of Dissenters*, ii. 130, &c. and in the *Saybrook Platform*, ed. New London, 1759, p. 99, &c. *Tr.*] William Whiston published the Articles of agreement, in the *Memoirs of his life and writings*, ii. 549, &c. They are nine in number. The 1st treats 'of Churches and Church Members.' Here, in § 6, the Presbyterians and Independents declare, 'that each particular church hath right to choose its own officers; and—hath authority from Christ for exercising government, and

of enjoying all the ordinances of worship within itself;' and § 7, that, 'in the administration of church power, it belongs to the pastors and other elders of every particular church (if such there be) to rule and govern; and to the brotherhood to consent according to the rule of the Gospel.' Here both the Presbyterians and the Independents depart from their original principles. Article II. treats 'of the Ministry.' They require the ministers of religion to be not only pious (§ 2), but also *learned*; and (§ 3, 4, 5) would have them be elected by the church, with the advice of the neighbouring churches, and also solemnly ordained. Article III. 'of Censures,' decrees that scandalous or offending members be first admonished; and if they do not reform, be excluded from the church, by the pastors; but with the consent of the brethren. Article IV. 'of Communion of Churches,' declares all churches to be on a perfect equality, and therefore *independent*; yet makes it the duty of the pastors and teachers to maintain a kind of communion of churches, and often to meet together and consult on the interests of the churches. Article V. 'of Deacons and Ruling Elders,' Here the United Brethren admit, that the office of Deacon, or curator of the poor, is of divine appointment; and say: 'Whereas divers are of opinion, that there is also the office of *ruling Elders*, who labour not in word and doctrine, and others think otherwise, we agree, that this difference make no breach among us.' Article VI. 'of Synods,' admits, that it is useful and necessary, in cases of importance, for the ministers of many churches to hold a council; and that the decisions formed in these conventions must not be despised by the churches, without the most weighty reasons. Article VII. 'of our demeanour towards the civil Magistrate;' promises obedience to magistrates, and prayers for them. Article VIII. treats 'of a Confession of Faith;' and leaves the brethren free to judge, whether the 39 Articles of the English Church, or the Confession and Catechism of the Westminster assembly, that is, of the Presbyterians, or lastly the

§ 22. While *Oliver Cromwell* administered the government of Great Britain, all sects, even the vilest and most absurd, had full liberty to publish their opinions: the bishops alone, and the friends of episcopal government, were most unjustly oppressed and stripped of all their revenues and honours. By far the most numerous and influential of all, were the *Presbyterians* and the *Independents*; the latter of whom were most favoured and extolled by *Cromwell* (who, however, actually belonged to no sect), and manifestly for the sake of curbing more easily the *Presbyterians*, who sought to acquire dominion.¹ In this period arose the *Fifth-monarchy men*, as they

Confession of the Congregational Brethren, published by the convention at the Savoy, in 1658, be most agreeable to the holy Scriptures. [Their words are: 'As to what appertains to soundness of judgment in matters of faith, we esteem it sufficient that a church acknowledge the Scriptures to be the word of God, the perfect and only rule of faith and practice; and own either the doctrinal part of those commonly called the Articles of the church of England, or the Confession, or Catechism, shorter or larger, compiled by the assembly at Westminster, or the Confession agreed on at the Savoy, to be agreeable to the said rule.' *Tr.*] Article IX. 'of our duty and deportment towards them that are not in communion with us;'—inculcates only love and moderation towards them. It hence appears, that the *Independents*, induced by necessity, approached in many points towards the opinions of the *Presbyterians*, and departed from the principles of their ancestors. [As respects union and communion of churches, their mutual accountability, and perhaps also the powers and prerogatives of church officers, there was some change in the views of the *Independents* of England, and also in America. But the English *Presbyterians* also softened considerably the rigours of *Presbyterianism*, as it was introduced and set up among them by the Scotch. This coalition of the two denominations tended to abate the zeal of both, in maintaining the *jus divinum* of their respective systems of church government. For a considerable time, the *Presbyterian* and *Congregational* ministers in and near London, continued to hold meetings for mutual consultation, and for regulating the licencing of candidates. And in some other counties of England, similar united meetings were held. But ere long, they were dropped; and the two denominations, though on friendly terms with each other, managed respectively their own ecclesiastical affairs in their own way. *Tr.*]

¹ [Mosheim's account of the *Presbyterians* is too meagre for those who are expected to read this translation of his work. It is, therefore, deemed necessary here to introduce a summary history, first of the *Scottish*

church, and then of the *English Presbyterians*, during this century.

The *Scottish church*.—From his first arrival in England, in 1603, king James set himself to undermine *Presbyterianism* in Scotland, and to establish *Episcopacy* on its ruins. For this purpose, he not only spoke contemptuously of the *Presbyterians*, as insolent men and enemies to regal power, but actually nominated bishops to the thirteen *Scottish bishoprics*; and in 1606, obtained from the parliament of Perth, an act, declaring the king to have sovereign authority over all estates, persons, and causes whatsoever, in Scotland; and also an act restoring to the bishops their ancient possessions which had been annexed to the crown. This made the new bishops peers of the realm. The General Assembly protested. But in 1608, a convention, claiming to be a General Assembly, declared the bishops perpetual moderators of all the Synods and *Presbyteries*. Another convention, however, was then sitting, in opposition to this; and committees from both attempted a compromise. The bishops carried their point in 1609: and the next year, the king, contrary to law, authorised them to hold *High Commission Courts*. In the same year (1610), a corrupt assembly was held at Glasgow, which sanctioned the right of the bishops to preside, personally, or by their representatives, in all the judicatories of the church, in all cases of discipline, ordination and deprivation of ministers, visitation of churches, &c. All ministers, at their ordination, were to swear obedience to their ordinary; and all clergymen were forbidden to preach or to speak against the acts of this assembly, or to touch at all the subject of the parity of ministers. Three *Scottish bishops* (Spotswood, Lamb, and Hamilton) were now sent to England, there to receive episcopal consecration: and on their return, they consecrated the rest. In 1617, king James made a journey into Scotland, chiefly to further the cause of episcopacy, which was advancing but slowly. The next year (1618), a convention, or General Assembly, composed very much of courtiers, met at Perth, and

were called; delirious persons who would have turned the world upside down. They taught that Jesus Christ would personally descend,

ordained kneeling at the sacrament, the administration of it in private houses, and to the sick, the private baptism of children, their confirmation by bishops, and the observance of Christmas, Easter, Whitsuntide, and Ascension day. These were called the *five Articles of Perth*. They were published by royal authority; and in 1621, a Scottish parliament was persuaded, though not without difficulty, to enact them into laws, against the remonstrances of great numbers of the clergy. Persecution ensued: and many ministers were fined, imprisoned, and banished, by the High Commission Court. During this reign, many Scotch Presbyterians moved to the north of Ireland, and there established flourishing churches. Charles I. followed up the measures pursued by his father. In 1633, he went to Scotland to be crowned; and there compelled a Scottish parliament to invest him with all the ecclesiastical powers possessed by his father, and also to confirm the laws of the last reign respecting religion. On leaving Scotland he erected a new bishopric at Edinburgh; and archbishop Laud drew up articles for regulating the royal chapel at Edinburgh; which was to be a pattern for all cathedrals, chapels, and parish churches. Hitherto the Scotch episcopal church had no settled liturgy: the king, therefore, ordered the Scotch bishops to draw up canons and a liturgy, similar to those of the English church. These being revised by Laud and other English bishops, were imposed upon the whole Scottish nation, by royal proclamation: the canons in 1635, and the liturgy in 1636. The attempts of the bishops to enforce these, without the sanction of a General Assembly, or of a Scottish parliament, threw the whole nation into commotion. The nobles, gentry, boroughs, and clergy, combined to resist these innovations; and in 1638, they solemnly revived the national covenant of 1580 and 1590. Hence, the king found it necessary to relax, not a little, his injunctions; and he now permitted a General Assembly to be called. But his commissioners, finding this body unmanageable, dissolved it. The Assembly, however, would not separate, but protested; and continuing their sessions, they disannulled the act of six preceding General Assemblies (namely, those of 1606, 1608, 1610, 1616, 1617, and 1618); abolished Episcopacy; condemned the five articles of Perth, the liturgy, canons, and high commission court; restored the Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies; and deposed all the bishops, save two, whom they allowed to remain as

parish ministers. The king now resorted to war, and marched an army into Scotland, in 1639. But a truce was concluded; and a new Assembly and a new parliament both met, and confirmed substantially the doings of the last Assembly. In 1640, the king raised another army, and renewed the war upon the Scots; but found it necessary to agree again to a truce; and also to assemble an English parliament, which was called the long parliament, because it sat twelve years, and which favoured the Scots in their controversy with the king. His English subjects were now alienated from him; and to be able to contend with English malcontents, the king concluded a peace with the Scots, by which he agreed to the total abolition of Episcopacy, and the entire restitution of Presbyterianism in that country. The peace, however, was of little service to him, as the English parliament and the Scots were on the most friendly terms. In 1642, the Scots offered to be mediators between the king and the English parliament; which the king resented highly. This drew closer the union between the Scots and the English parliament. The Scots now formed the design of establishing Presbyterianism, as the only religion, throughout Great Britain and Ireland. To this project the English parliament, in order to secure the co-operation of the Scots in their war with the king, was led to yield assent. Commissioners from the General Assembly of Scotland were now admitted to sit in the Westminster Assembly of divines; and the Scotch had great influence in all the ecclesiastical affairs of England, till the time of Cromwell's usurpation. In 1643, at their instance, the English parliament assented to the Scotch national Covenant, somewhat modified, and now denominated the solemn League and Covenant; which it also recommended, and at length *enjoined* upon the whole English nation. The Scotch strenuously opposed all toleration of any but Presbyterians, in either country. This alienated the Independents, Baptists, and other sectarians from them; and the English parliament found it necessary to proceed with caution. In 1646, the king surrendered himself to the Scotch; and they delivered him over to the English parliament; hoping thus to induce them resolutely to enforce Presbyterianism over the three kingdoms. But the parliament was so irresolute, that the Scotch became jealous of it. After Charles I. was beheaded, in 1649, the Scotch proclaimed Charles II. king; and declared against the English *Commonwealth*. In 1649, they

and establish a new and heavenly kingdom on the earth.¹ Now arose the *Quakers*, to whom, as they have continued to the present time,

entered into negotiations with the new king, in Holland, who then professedly acceded to the national covenant. The next year, the king landed in Scotland; but his army was defeated by Cromwell. In 1651, Charles II. was crowned in Scotland; and then sworn to observe the solemn League and Covenant. After this he marched an army into England, suffered a total defeat, and fled in disguise to France. General Monk, whom Cromwell had left in Scotland, soon reduced that whole country to submit, and to become united with the Commonwealth of England; and also to allow a free toleration, to which the Presbyterians were much opposed. Commissioners were now sent into Scotland, by the English parliament, to establish liberty of conscience there. Thus things remained till the restoration. Presbyterianism was the established religion of Scotland; but dissenters were allowed to live in peace, and to worship in their own way. At the restoration, in 1661, a Scottish parliament rescinded all acts and covenants, relative to religion, made or entered into since the commencement of the civil troubles, and empowered the king to settle the ecclesiastical establishment at his pleasure. He ordained Presbyterianism for the present; but soon after, though with some hesitation, ordered Episcopacy in its place. Sharp, Fairfowl, Leighton, and Hamilton, were consecrated bishops. Under Charles II., from 1662 to 1685, the Scotch Presbyterians suffered very much as the English Non-conformists did; for similar laws and measures were adopted in both countries. James II. pursued the same persecuting course, till 1687, when, in order to advance popery, he granted universal toleration. On the revolution, in 1688, the Scotch Presbyterian church regained all its liberties and prerogatives, which it has enjoyed with little diminution to the present day. But the troubles it experienced during the reigns of James I. and his sons, had induced many Scotch Presbyterians to emigrate to the north of Ireland, to North America, and elsewhere. See Neal's *Hist. of the Puritans*; Crookshank's *Hist. of the state and sufferings of the Church of Scotland*; Burnet's *History of his own Times*; Spotswood, and various others.

The *English Presbyterians*.—Most of the early English Puritans, from their intercourse with the foreign Reformed churches, which were all Presbyterian, were more or less attached to Presbyterian forms of worship and church government. But as the English bishops, in the reign of queen Elizabeth, generally admitted the validity of foreign

or Presbyterian ordination; while the Puritans or Presbyterians, on the other hand, admitted the validity of ordination by bishops, and the lawfulness of bishops of some sort; hence the principal difficulty of the English Puritans or Presbyterians, in those times, related to the rites of *worship*. (Neal, *Hist. of Puritans*, i. 386.) In 1572, several of the more strenuous Puritans, despairing of any further reformation of the English church by public authority, proceeded secretly to organise the first Presbyterian church in England, at Wandsworth, five miles from London. This church, though persecuted, continued to exist: and others were formed on the model of it. But the greater part of the clergy who were inclined to Presbyterian views, remained in connexion with the established church, and bore the general appellation of Puritans. Many of them, however, kept up voluntary meetings among themselves, for mutual advice and counsel, in a kind of presbyteries and synods. In 1586, there were more than 500 such ministers in England. How long, and how extensively, these informal and voluntary meetings were maintained, it is difficult to say. But this is certain, that although persecution induced great numbers to remove to America, Ireland, and elsewhere, yet the number of Presbyterians that remained, under the general appellation of Puritans, was very considerable; and it greatly increased during the reigns of James I. and Charles I., prior to 1642, when Episcopacy was abolished by act of parliament. In 1643, the English parliament selected 121 of the ablest divines of England with 30 lay assessors, whom they commanded to meet at Westminster, and aid them by their counsel, in settling the government, worship, and doctrines of the church of England. This was the famous Westminster Assembly of divines; which continued to meet, and to discuss such subjects as the parliament submitted to their consideration, during several years. They were men of different sentiments, Presbyterians, Erastians, and Independents, with some moderate Episcopals. But a great majority were Presbyterians. Besides, not long after this assembly met, the General Assembly of the Scottish church, at the request of the English parliament, sent four commissioners to this body, on condition that the whole Westminster Assembly and the parliament would take the solemn League and Covenant, and agree to establish one uniform religion throughout the three kingdoms. The parliament reluctantly assented to the condition, for the sake of

¹ For this note, see ¹, p. 377.

we shall devote a separate chapter. Now the furious *Anabaptists* were allowed to utter freely whatever a disordered mind might suggest.¹

securing the co-operation of the Scotch in their political designs. Before the Scottish commissioners arrived, the Westminster Assembly commenced revising the 39 Articles; and went over the first 15, making some slight alterations. After the arrival of the Scotch commissioners, and the adoption of the solemn League and Covenant, in Feb. 1644, the Assembly, by order of parliament, drew up an Exhortation to the people of England, to assent to the solemn League. The November following, they were ordered to write a circular letter to the foreign reformed churches, acquainting them with the proceedings in England. Through this Assembly, the parliament licenced preachers, and directed all ecclesiastical affairs. They next drew up a Directory for public worship; which was sanctioned by the parliament, January, 1645. The same year, they drew up a Directory for the ordination of ministers, and a Directory for church discipline and government. After warm debate, the majority of the Assembly declared for Presbyterianism, as of divine institution; but the parliament voted for it, only as 'lawful, and agreeable to the word of God.' The Assembly also put the supreme ecclesiastical power wholly into the hands of the church judicatories; but the parliament imposed restrictions; and, to the great dissatisfaction of the Scotch and most of the English Presbyterians, allowed an appeal from the highest ecclesiastical judicatory to the parliament. In March, 1646, parliament ordered ruling elders to be chosen, in all the churches of England; and also the erection of Presbyteries, Synods, and a General Assembly, for a trial of the system. The Scotch church objected to several imperfections, in the Presbyterianism thus established by the English parliament; and particularly to the right of appeal, in the last resort, from the ecclesiastical court, to the parliament: and the English Presbyterians, and the Westminster Assembly, sided with the Scotch. In May, 1646, the king being now in the hands of the Scotch, the English Presbyterians determined to enforce Presbyterianism, *jure divino*, on all England; and to allow no toleration of dissenters. For this purpose, they caused a strong remonstrance to be presented to the parliament, in the name of the lord-mayor, aldermen, and common council of London; and they were supported by the whole weight of the Scottish nation. On the contrary, the Independents and other sectarians in the army, procured a counter-petition from numerous citizens of London. The commons were divided in sentiment, and at

a loss how to proceed. To gain time, they demanded of the Westminster Assembly, scripture proofs for that *jus divinum* in church government, which they had maintained. It may be remarked, that from 1644 to 1647, the Independents, who were rapidly increasing in number, uniformly pleaded for the free toleration of all sects holding the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. And the parliament were not unwilling to admit toleration, at least of the Independents. But the Presbyterians were utterly opposed to it; and their influence prevented the parliament from pursuing the course they would have done. This it was that alienated the Independents and the army from Presbyterianism, and from the parliament; and finally led to the subversion of the whole Presbyterian establishment set up in England. The demand of the house of commons for scriptural proof of the divine authority of Presbyterianism, produced long and warm debates in the Westminster Assembly. The Erastians and Independents at length protested, and withdrew. The Presbyterians, 53 in number, now left alone, voted, with but one dissenting voice, that 'Christ has appointed a church government, distinct from the civil magistrates.' On the other points, referred to them, they were afraid to report their views, lest the parliament should put them under a *præmunire*. But the Presbyterian divines of London met at Sion College, answered fully the questions of the house of commons, and maintained in strong terms the *jus divinum* of Presbyterianism. Yet in a second meeting, they lowered their tone somewhat; and agreed to set up the limited Presbyterianism, already sanctioned by the parliament. This consisted of parochial presbyteries (or church sessions), classes (or presbyteries), provincial assemblies (or synods), and a national assembly; with an appeal to the parliament, in the last resort. The province of London was now distributed into 12 classes, containing 138 parochial presbyteries. The next year (1647), provincial assemblies (synods) actually met in London and in Lancashire; and in those counties only, under the act of parliament. The provincial assembly of London continued to meet semi-annually, till the end of Cromwell's reign. In the other parts of England, the Presbyterians continued to meet in their voluntary conventions for ecclesiastical affairs, which had not the sanction of law. The king, though a prisoner, refused his assent to this new ecclesiastical constitution of England. At the same time, he tried to detach the

¹ For this note, see ² p. 377.

Now the *Deists*, who reduced all religion to a very few precepts inculcated by reason and the light of nature, gathered themselves a

Scotch from the English, by promising them Presbyterianism for Scotland, with Episcopacy for England. But they rejected his offers, hoping still to bless England as well as Scotland with Presbyterianism *jure divino*. He also tried to gain over the Independents, by promising them free toleration: but they would not accept it for themselves alone. The country now swarmed with sectarians, and numerous lay preachers, of every description. Thomas Edwards, in his *Gangræna*, mentions sixteen sects; namely, Independents, Brownists, Millenarists, Antinomians, Anabaptists, Armians, Libertines, Familists, Enthusiasts, Seekers, Perfectionists, Socinians, Arians, Antitrinitarians, Antiscripturists, and Sceptics. Mr. Baxter mentions the Independents, Anabaptists, and Antinomians, as being the chief separatists from the established or Presbyterian church: to whom he adds Seekers, Ranters, Behemists, and Varists, which either became extinct, or were merged into Quakers. The English divines would have been satisfied with revising the 39 Articles; and therefore commenced such a revision. But the Scotch divines insisted on a new Confession. Hence the Westminster Assembly, after the arrival of the Scotch commissioners, drew up their elaborate Confession; which the house of commons approved, with some amendments, in the summer of 1647, and the winter following. But, the house of lords objecting to the articles on church government, only the doctrinal part of the Confession obtained parliamentary sanction, in the year 1648. The Scotch nation adopted the Confession as drawn up by the Assembly. The Assembly's Shorter Catechism was presented to parliament in 1647; and the Larger Catechism in 1648. Both were allowed to be used, by authority of the English parliament. The Scotch commissioners in the Assembly now returned home; but the Assembly was continued, as a sort of counsel to parliament, yet did little else than licence preachers. The army being composed chiefly of dissenters from the establishment, of various descriptions, upon finding that no toleration of dissenters was allowed by the new ecclesiastical constitution, demanded of the parliament free toleration for *all* protestant dissenters. This the Presbyterians vigorously opposed: and the parliament endeavoured to disband the army. But the army now rescued the king from the hands of the parliament, and became peremptory in their demands. Pressed by the Presbyterians on the one hand, and by the army on the other, parlia-

ment wavered for a time; but at length fell under the control of the army, and not only allowed of dissent from the establishment, but also made no vigorous efforts to set up Presbyterianism. But in May, 1648, the Scotch, having made a separate treaty with the king, invaded England, in order to rescue him. The war obliged the army to march in various directions; and the Presbyterians seized the opportunity, in the parliament, to enforce Presbyterianism. An act was proposed, declaring eight specified heresies to be capital crimes, and sixteen others to be punishable with unlimited imprisonment. The act was not passed. But in June following, another did pass, placing 'all parishes and places whatsoever, in England and Wales,' except chapels of the king and peers, under the Presbyterian government, with allowance of no other worship; yet without making it penal to neglect this worship. The parliament likewise commenced a negotiation with the king, for his restoration, upon the basis of a single religion, with no toleration of any other. The king insisted on Episcopacy of some sort; and the parliament, on Presbyterianism. The army, after repelling the Scotch invasion, finding that neither the king nor the parliament intended ever to allow toleration to sectaries, again seized the king's person; and marching to London, sifted the house of commons, new modelled the government, and caused the king to be impeached, and beheaded. The *Commonwealth*, without a king or a house of lords, was now set up. But the Scotch refused to acknowledge it, recognised Charles II. for their king, and threatened war upon England. The English Presbyterians took sides with their Scottish brethren, disowned the parliament, and declared against a general toleration. All people were now required to swear fidelity to the new government; which many of the Presbyterian clergy refusing to do, were turned out. However, to conciliate the Presbyterians, the parliament continued the late Presbyterian establishment: but repealed all acts compelling uniformity. The Scotch, aided by the English Presbyterians, invaded England, in order to place Charles II. on the throne: but they were vanquished, and all Scotland was compelled to submit to the parliament, and moreover, to allow of toleration in their own country. The solemn League and Covenant was laid aside; and nothing but the *Engagement* (or oath of allegiance to the government) was required of any man to qualify him civilly for any living in the country. Hence many Episcopal divines,

company, with impunity, under their leaders *Sidney, Henry Neville, Martin, and Harrington.*³

as well as those of other denominations, became parish ministers. In the year 1653, the army, being offended with the parliament (which had now sat twelve years, and, during the last four, had ruled without a king or house of lords), ordered them to disperse; and general Cromwell, with the other officers, appointed a new council of state, and selected 140 men from the several counties to represent the people. After five months, these new representatives resigned their power to Cromwell and the other officers; who framed a new constitution, with a single house of representatives, chosen in the three kingdoms, and a Protector, with ample executive powers, elected for life. All sects of Christians, except Papists and Episcopalians, were to have free toleration. Cromwell, the Protector, laboured to make persons of all religions feel easy under him; but he absolutely forbade the clergy from meddling with politics. Ministers of different denominations in the county towns, now began to form associations for brotherly counsel and advice. But the more rigid Presbyterians, as well as the Episcopalians, stood aloof from such associations. The right of ordaining parish ministers had for some years been exclusively in the hands of the Presbyterians; but Cromwell, in March, 1654, appointed a board of thirty *Tryers*, composed of Presbyterians and Independents, with two or three Baptists, to examine and licence preachers throughout England. The same year he appointed lay commissioners in every county, with full power to eject scandalous, ignorant, and incompetent ministers and schoolmasters. Both these ordinances were confirmed by parliament. Such was the state of the English Presbyterians during the protectorate of Oliver Cromwell. On the accession of his son, Richard Cromwell, the Presbyterians, seeing no prospect of the restoration of the solemn League and Covenant, or of their obtaining ecclesiastical dominion over England, under the existing form of government, formed a coalition with the royalists, in 1659, in order to restore the king. The remains of the Long Parliament were resuscitated, and placed over the nation. The members, excluded from it in 1648, were recalled, and took their seats: and thus it became more than half Presbyterian. This parliament, in 1660, voted that the concessions offered by the king in the negotiations at the Isle of Wight in 1648, were satisfactory; restored Presbyterianism completely, together with the solemn League and Covenant, appointed a new council of state, ordered that a new parliament should

be chosen, and then dissolved. The Presbyterians, who now had the whole power of the country in their own hands, were so zealous to prevent the election of republicans to the new parliament, that when it met, it was decidedly in favour of a monarchy. Parliament now recalled the king, without making any stipulations with him respecting the religion of the country. He very soon restored Episcopacy; and then would grant no toleration to any class of dissenters. The Presbyterians, who had the most to lose, were the greatest sufferers. Some hundreds of their ministers were immediately displaced, to make way for the old Episcopal incumbents. And in 1662, the act of uniformity made it criminal to dissent from the established or Episcopal church; and of course exposed all dissenters to persecution. A number of the Presbyterian ministers conformed, in order to retain their places; but more than 2,000 ministers, most of them Presbyterians, were turned out. And during this and the succeeding reign, or till the accession of William and Mary, in 1688, the Presbyterians, equally with the other dissenters, suffered persecution. For though the kings, after the year 1672, were inclined to give toleration to all, in order to advance popery, yet parliament and the bishops resisted it. When the revolution in 1688 placed a tolerant sovereign on the throne, and thus relieved the English Presbyterians from persecution, they were comparatively an enfeebled and humble sect; and being no longer strenuous for the solemn League and Covenant, and for the *jus divinum* of Presbyterianism, they were willing to have friendly intercourse and fellowship with Independents, and soon became as catholic in their views, as most of the other English dissenters. See Heylin's *Hist. of the Presbyterians*; Neal's *Hist. of the Puritans*; Bogue and Bennet's *Hist. of Dissenters*; Baxter's *Hist. of his own Times*; Burnet's *Hist. of his own Times*; Grant's *Hist. of the Eng. Church and Sects*; and others. Tr.]

¹ Gilb. Burnet's *Hist. of his own Times*, i. 67. [Neal's *Hist. of the Puritans*, iv. ch. v. p. 113, 343, &c. Tr.]

² [Mosheim seems to have taken it for granted, that the English Baptists of this age, because they were called *Anabaptists*, resembled the old Anabaptists of Germany; whereas they were *Menonites*, and though illiterate, and somewhat enthusiastic, they were a people in whom was not a little Christian simplicity and piety. Tr.]

³ Dan. Neal's *History of the Puritans*, iv. 87 [ed. Boston, 1817, p. 112, 113. Tr.]

§ 23. During this period also arose, among the Presbyterians, the party called *Antinomians*, or enemies of the law; which has continued to our day, and has caused at times no little commotion. The *Antinomians* are over-rigid *Calvinists*, who are thought, by the other *Presbyterians*, to abuse *Calvin's* doctrine of the absolute decrees of God to the injury of the cause of piety.¹ Some of them (for they do not all hold the same sentiments) deny that it is necessary for ministers to exhort Christians to holiness and obedience to the law; because those whom God has from all eternity elected to salvation, will of themselves, without being admonished and exhorted by any one, perform good and holy deeds, under a divine influence, and an impulse of overpowering grace; while those who are destined by the divine decrees to eternal punishment, though admonished and entreated ever so much, will not obey the law; nor *can* they obey the divine law, since divine grace is denied them: it is, consequently, sufficient, in preaching to the people, to hold up the Gospel and faith in Jesus Christ. But others merely² hold, that the elect, because they cannot lose the divine favour, do not truly commit sin and break the law, although they should go contrary to its precepts and do wicked actions; wherefore, that they are under no necessity to confess their sins, or to grieve for them: that adultery, for instance, in one of the elect, appears to us, indeed, to be sin or a violation of the law, yet it is no sin in the sight of God; because one who is elected to salvation, can do nothing displeasing to God, and forbidden by the law.³

§ 24. Certain wise and peace-loving persons, moved by the numerous calamities and sufferings of their country arising from want of moderation in religious disputes, felt it to be their duty to search for a method of uniting in some measure such of the contending parties as would regard reason and religion, or at least of dissuading them from ruinous contentions. They, therefore, took middle ground between the more violent *Episcopalians* on the one part, and the more stiff *Presbyterians* and *Independents* on the other; hoping, that if the contentions of these could be settled, the minor parties would fall by their own arms. The contests of the former related partly to the forms of church government and public worship, and partly to cer-

¹ See Jo. Toland's Letter to Le Clerc; in the *Bibliothèque Universelle et Historique* of the latter, xxiii. 505, &c. Jo. Hornbeck's *Summa Controversiar.* p. 800, 812, &c.

² [This second *Antinomian* opinion is so much worse than the preceding, that it is strange Dr. Mosheim should say of it, 'Alii vero tantum statuunt,' others merely hold. *Tr.*]

³ Other tenets of the *Antinomians*, kindred with this, and the more recent disputes, occasioned by the posthumous works of Tobias Crisp (a distinguished *Antinomian* preacher), in which Jo. Tillotson, Baxter, and especially Daniel Williams (in his celebrated work, *Gospel Truth stated and*

vindicated), vigorously assailed the *Antinomians*, are stated, though with some errors, by Peter Francis le Courayer, *Examen des Défauts Théologiques*, ii. 198, &c. Amsterd. 1744, 8vo. [See also Bogue and Bennet's *Hist. of Dissenters*, i. 399, &c. and Hannah Adams's *Dictionary of all Religions*, art. *Antinomians*. One of the chief sources of *Antinomian* opinions was, the received doctrines of *substitution*. If *Christ* took the *place of the elect*, and in *their stead* both obeyed the law perfectly, and suffered its penalty, it was hard for some to see what further demands the law could have upon *them*, or what more they had to do with it. *Tr.*]

tain doctrines, particularly those on which the Reformed and the Arminians were at variance. To bring both classes of contests to a close, these mediators laboured to draw the disputants off from those narrow views which they had embraced, and to exhibit a broader way of salvation. And hence they were commonly called *Latitudinarians*.¹ In the first place, they were attached to the form of church government, and the mode of public worship, established by the laws of England, and they recommended them exclusively to others: yet they would not have it believed, that these were of divine institution, and absolutely necessary. And hence they inferred, that those who approved other forms of church government, and other modes of worship, were to be tolerated, and to be treated as brethren, unless they were chargeable with other faults. In the next place, as to religion they chose *Simon Episcopus* for their guide; and in imitation of him maintained, that there are but few things which a Christian *must* know and believe, in order to be saved. Hence it followed, that neither the *Episcopalians*, who embraced the sentiments of the Arminians, nor the *Presbyterians* and *Independents*, who adopted the sentiments of the Genevans, had just reason for contending with so much zeal and animosity: because their disputes related to unessential points, which might be explained variously, without the loss of salvation. The most distinguished of the *Latitudinarians* were the eminent *John Hales* and *William Chillingworth*, whose names are still in veneration among the English.² With them were joined *Henry More*, *Ralph Cudworth*, *Theophilus Gale*, *John Whichcot*, *John Tillotson*, and various others. The first reward for their labour which these men received, was to be called Atheists, Deists, and Socinians, not only by the papists, but also by the English dissentients. But on the restoration of the English monarchy under *Charles II.* they were advanced to the highest stations, and received general approbation. And it is well known, that the English church at the present day [1753] is under the direction, for the most part, of such *Latitudinarians*. Yet there are some among the bishops and the other clergy, who, following rather in the steps of *Laud*, are denominated the *High-Church* and *Ecclesiastical Tories*.³

¹ Gilbert Burnet's *History of his own Times*, book ii. vol. i. p. 188, &c.

² An accurately written life of the very acute John Hales, was published in English, by Peter des Maizeaux, London, 1719, 8vo. A Latin and more full history of the life of Hales, we have ourselves prefixed to his *History of the Synod of Dort*, Hamb. 1724, 8vo. A French life of him, not entirely correct, is in the first volume of Chillingworth's book, immediately to be noticed, p. 73, &c. A life of Chillingworth, in English, was composed by the same Des Maizeaux, and published, London, 1725, 8vo. A French translation of it is prefixed to the French version of his very noted work, *The religion of Protestants a safe way*

of salvation, printed at Amsterdam, 1730, in 3 vols. 8vo. Such as would acquaint themselves with the regulations, doctrines, and views of the Church of England in latter times, should acquaint themselves with these two men, and, in particular, should carefully study the above-named work of Chillingworth.

³ *Thorrays Ecclesiastici*. Rapin-Thoyras, Dissertation on the Whigs and Tories; in his *History of England* [French edition], x. 234. [See an admirable defence of the *Latitudinarian* divines, in a book entitled, *The Principles and Practices of certain moderate divines of the Church of England* (greatly misunderstood) *truly represented and defended*, London, 1670, 8vo. This

§ 25. On the restoration of *Charles II.* to the throne of his father in 1660, the ancient forms of ecclesiastical government and public worship returned also, and the bishops recovered their lost dignities. Those who preferred other forms, or the *Nonconformists* as they are called in England, expected, that some place would be assigned to them in the church: but their hopes were quickly disappointed. For *Charles* again placed bishops over the Scotch, who were so religiously attached to the Genevan discipline; and likewise over the Irish. And afterwards, in the year 1662, all those who refused to subject themselves to the rites and institutions of the English church, were by a public law separated wholly from its communion.¹ From this period till the times of *William* and *Mary*, the *Nonconformists* experienced various fortune, sometimes more pleasant, and sometimes more sad, according to the disposition of the court and the government; but at no time were they so happy as not either to feel or fear persecution.² But in the year 1689, *William III.*, by an express act of parliament, freed all dissenters from the established church (except Socinians) from all liability to the penalties to which they were by law exposed.³ He also permitted the Scottish nation to live under their Genevan regulations, and delivered them from the jurisdiction of bishops. This, therefore, may be regarded as the commencement of that liberty and freedom from molestation which are still enjoyed by the religious bodies averse from the public rites of the English church; but it was also the commencement of those numerous parties and sects which spring up from year to year in that fortunate island, often more suddenly than mushrooms, and which distract the people with their new inventions and opinions.⁴

§ 26. In the reign of this *William III.*, A.D. 1689, arose a very noted schism in the English episcopal church, which, quite down to the present times, no means have been able to remove. *William*

book was written by Dr. Fowler, afterwards bishop of Gloucester.' *Macl.*]

¹ Dan. Neal's *History of the Puritans*, iv. 358 [ed. Boston, 1817, p. 396, &c.] Rapiu-Thoyras, *Histoire d'Angleterre*, ix. 198, &c. David Wilkins, *Concilia Magnæ Britannię et Hibernię*, iv. 573. [This was the famous *Act of Uniformity*, which required all clergymen, not only to use the liturgy, but also to swear to renounce and condemn the solemn League and Covenant, Presbyterian ordination, and all efforts for changing the present establishment. In consequence of this act, about 2,000 ministers, chiefly *Presbyterians*, were turned out of their churches, because they could not conform to the law. At the same time, all the old laws against conventicles, neglect of the parish churches, &c. were revived; and these made all *Non-conformists* liable to civil prosecution. *Tr.*]

² Daniel Neal treats particularly of these events in the fourth volume of his *History of the Puritans*.

³ This act, which is called *The Toleration Act*, is subjoined to Dan. Neal's *History of the Puritans*, vol. iv. [ed. Boston, 1817, vol. v. p. 386, &c. By it all dissenters from the church of England, except Papists and Antitrinitarians, by taking an oath of allegiance, and subscribing to the doctrinal part of the 39 Articles (or if Quakers, making equivalent affirmations), are exempted from all the penalties prescribed by the acts which enforce uniformity; and are allowed to erect houses of worship, have their own preachers, and to meet and worship according to their own views, provided they do not when met lock or bolt their doors. They are not, however, exempted from tithes, and other payments for the support of the established churches; nor are they excused from the oaths required by the Corporation and Test Acts, which exclude Nonconformists from all civil offices. *Tr.*]

⁴ Gilbert Burnet's *History of his own Times*, ii. 23.

Sancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, and seven other bishops,¹ all men distinguished for their learning and purity of morals, declared that they could not in conscience take the oath of fidelity to the new king *William III.*; because *James II.*, though expelled from the kingdom, was, in their view, the legitimate king of England. As no arguments could induce them to recede from this opinion, they were deprived of their offices, in 1690, by a decree of the English parliament; and other bishops were appointed in their places. The bishops who were deposed and turned out of their episcopal dwellings, founded a new church in the bosom of the English church, differing from the rest of the church in opinions, in the form of worship, and in other respects.² From the cause that produced the

¹ [The other Non-juring bishops were Dr. Lloyd, bishop of Norwich; Dr. Turner, of Ely; Dr. Ken, of Bath and Wells; Dr. Frampton, of Gloucester; Dr. Thomas, of Worcester; Dr. Lake, of Chichester; Dr. White, bishop of Peterborough.] *Macl.*

² [The language of Mosheim here, would seem to imply, that the Non-juring bishops produced a formal secession from the established church, and erected a permanent sect, which differed in doctrines and in its forms of worship from the church of England. But it was only a temporary disagreement, whether William III. or James II. was the legal sovereign; and of course whether those bishops and priests, who were deprived for not taking the oath of allegiance to the former, or those who were appointed to fill their places, were the legitimate bishops and parish ministers. Both parties professed the same faith, adhered to the same discipline, and used the same liturgy, except that the non-jurors are said to have framed and used a prayer for king James and for their party. It was rather a political than a religious schism; and one which necessarily terminated on the death of the pretender, and of the deprived bishops and clergy. Some principles, indeed, which were then contended for, continued to be maintained, after they became little more than points of theoretical speculation; and the believing or disbelieving these principles, soon constituted the only difference between the two parties. *Tr.*—‘It is stated that at some period within the two or three first years after the Revolution, probably in the year 1691 or 1692, the exiled king ordered a list of the non-juring clergy to be sent over to him: a list was accordingly made out, as perfect as could be procured in the existing state of things, considering the unwillingness, which, for obvious reasons, many must have felt to have their names appear in such a list. Out of the number whose names were thus sent over, it is related, that, at the request of the non-juring bishops, king James nominated two for the

continuance of the episcopal succession, the one to derive his spiritual functions and authority from Archbishop *Sancroft*, the other from Bishop Lloyd of Norwich, the eldest suffragan bishop. The two appointed were Dr. George Hikes and Mr. Thomas Wagstaffe: the former was consecrated by the title of suffragan of Thetford, the latter by that of suffragan of Ipswich. The archbishop died before their consecration, and his archiepiscopal functions were performed on the occasion by the bishop of Norwich’ (whom he had appointed his vicar in all ecclesiastical matters, by an instrument dated Feb. 9, 1691), ‘assisted by the other non-juring bishops.’ *D’Oyly’s Life of Sancroft*, Lond. 1840, p. 296.

‘The succession of bishops and presbyters among the non-jurors was continued during the greater part of the last century. Dr. Hikes appears to have been the leading person amongst them; and during his lifetime all those who joined in the setting up of a rival communion remained compact. Afterwards they became much divided. The number of non-juring bishops seems to have varied at different times. In 1716, there were five, Jeremy Collier, Nathaniel Spinkes, Hawes, and two others. Among the names of persons afterwards consecrated were those of Dr. Deacon, Dr. Thomas Brett, Mr. Thomas Brett, Mr. Smith of Durham, Dr. Rawlinson, and Dr. Gordon. The latter died in London, November, 1779, and is supposed to have been the last non-juring bishop. He left behind him two or three presbyters. The non-juring bishops were always particularly strict in their consecrations, which were performed by at least three bishops, the acts of consecration being always signed, sealed, and properly attested, and carefully preserved. Dr. Deacon separated himself from the other non-jurors, and himself alone consecrated one or more bishops; but these consecrations never were allowed by the main body. The succeeding bishops of the non-jurors were not consecrated with any particular titles, as were the first bishops

disunion, this church was called that of the *Non-jurors*; and on account of the opinion which it maintained, and continues to maintain, respecting the authority of the church, it received the name of *High Church*; that is, one entertaining very exalted ideas of the prerogatives and authority of the church: to which is opposed the *Low Church*, or that which has more moderate views of the power of the church.¹ The deprived bishops, with their friends and followers, contended that the church is not subject to the civil authority, and to parliaments, but to God only, and has the power of self-government; and consequently, that the decree of parliament against them was unjust and a nullity: and that an ecclesiastical council only has power, by its decrees, to deprive a bishop of his office. The celebrated *Henry Dodwell* was the first that contended fiercely for these rights and this power of the church. He was followed by several others: and hence arose this perplexing and difficult controversy respecting the church, which has not yet closed, and which is renewed with zeal from time to time.²

§ 27. The *Non-jurors* or *High Church*, who claimed for themselves the appellation of the *Orthodox*, and called the *Low Church* the *Schismatical*, differed from the rest of the episcopal church in several particulars and regulations, but especially in the following sentiments. I. That it is never lawful for the people, under any provocation or pretext whatever, to resist their kings and sovereigns. The English call this the doctrine of *passive obedience*; the opposite of which is the doctrine of *active obedience* [lawful resistance], held by those who deem it lawful, in certain cases, for the people to

by those of suffragans of Thetford and Ipswich. There were many very eminent and learned men amongst the non-jurors at different times; amongst others, Collier, Leslie, Dr. Brett, Dodwell, and Nelson. It is supposed that at the end of the last century, there was not a single non-juring congregation or minister remaining.³ D'Oyly, p. 296, note. S.]

¹ The name of *High Church*, that is, of those who have high notions of the church and of its power, properly belongs to the *Non-jurors*. But it is usual among the English to give it a more extensive application; and to apply it to all those who extol immoderately the authority of the church, and declare it exempt from all human power, notwithstanding they do not refuse to swear allegiance to the king. And there are many such, even in that church which generally goes under the name of the *Low Church*. [The *Non-jurors* were also called *Jacobites*, from their adherence to James II. and his son the pretender, in opposition to the reigning sovereign and the house of Hanover. The Scottish bishops, after 1688, all adhered to the house of Stuart, and were called *Non-jurors*, because they refused the oath of allegiance

to the reigning sovereign. Tr.]

² [Henry Dodwell, senior, was appointed Camden professor of History at Oxford in 1688; and being deprived of the office in 1690, because he refused the oath of allegiance, he published a vindication of the non-juring principles. Several other tracts were published by him and others on the same side; none of which were suffered to go unanswered. In 1691, Dr. Humphrey Hody published his *Unreasonableness of Separation, or a Treatise out of ecclesiastical history, showing, that although a bishop was unjustly deprived, neither he nor the church ever made a separation, if the successor was not a heretic*; translated out of an ancient Greek manuscript (written at Constantinople, and now among the Baroccean MSS.) in the public library at Oxford. This was answered by Dodwell, the next year, in his *Vindication of the deprived Bishops, &c.* Dr. Hody replied, in *The case of the sees vacant, &c.* In 1695, Dodwell came forth again, in his *Defence of the Vindication of the deprived Bishops*. Various others engaged in this controversy. See Maclaine's Note; Calamy's Additions to Baxter's *Hist. of his own Life and Times*, ch. xvii. p. 465, &c. ch. xviii. p. 485, &c. 506, &c. Tr.]

oppose their rulers and kings. II. That the hereditary succession of kings is of divine appointment; and, therefore, can be set aside or annulled in no case whatever. III. That the church is subject to the jurisdiction, not of the civil magistrate, but of God only, particularly in matters of a religious nature. IV. That, consequently, *Sancreft* and the other bishops who were deposed under king *William III.* remained the true bishops as long as they lived; and that those substituted in their places were the unjust possessors of other men's property. V. That these unjust possessors of other men's offices were both bad citizens and bad members of the church, or were both rebels and schismatics; and, therefore, that such as held communion with them were chargeable with rebellion and schism. VI. That schism, or splitting the church in pieces, is the most heinous sin; the punishment due to which no one can escape but by returning with sincerity to the true church from which he has revolted.¹

§ 28. We now pass over to the Hollanders, who live opposite the English. The ministers of the Dutch churches thought themselves happy when the enemies of the Calvinistic doctrine of decrees, or the Arminians, were vanquished and put out: but it was not their fortune to enjoy tranquillity very long. For after this victory they fell, as ill luck would have it, into such contests among themselves, that, during nearly the whole century, Holland was the scene of very fierce animosity and strife. It is neither easy, nor important, to enumerate all these contentions. We shall therefore omit the disputes between individual doctors respecting certain points both of doctrine and discipline; such as the disputes between those men of high reputation, *Gisbert Voet* and *Samuel Maresius* [*des Murets*]; the disputes about false hair, interest for money, stage-plays, and other minute moral questions, between *Salmasius*, *Boxhorn*, *Voet*, and several others; and the contest respecting the power of the magistrate in matters of religion, carried on by *William Apollonius*, *James Trigland*, *Nicholas Vedel*, and others, and which destroyed friendship between *Frederic Spanheim* and *John van der Wayen*. For these and similar disputes rather show what were the sentiments of certain eminent divines upon particular doctrines and points of morality, than lay open the internal state of the church. This can only be known from those controversies which disquieted either the whole church, or at least a large portion of it.

§ 29. The principal controversies of this sort were those respecting the Cartesian philosophy and the new opinions of *Cocceius*: for these have not yet terminated, and they have produced two very powerful parties, the *Cocceians* and the *Voëtians*; which once made a prodigious noise, though now they are more silent. The Cocceian

¹ See William Whiston's *Memoirs of his own Life and Writings*, i. 30, &c. George Hickes, *Memoirs of the Life of John Kettlewell*, Lond. 1718, 8vo, who treats expressly and largely on these matters. *Nouveau*

Dictionnaire Histor. et Critique, article *Collier*, ii. 112. Phil. Masson's *Histoire Critique de la Républ. des Lettres*, xiii. 298, &c. and elsewhere.

theology and the Cartesian philosophy have no natural connexion; and therefore the controversies respecting them were not related to each other. Yet it so happened that the followers of these two very distinct systems of doctrine formed very nearly one and the same party, those who took *Cocceius* for their guide in theology, adhering to *Des Cartes* as their master in philosophy:¹ because those who assailed the Cartesians attacked also *Cocceius* and his followers, and opposed both with equal animosity. Hence the Cartesians and Cocceians were under a kind of necessity to unite and combine their forces in order the better to defend their cause against such a host of adversaries. The *Voëtiens* derived their name from *Gisbert Voet*, a very famous divine of Utrecht, who set up the standard, as it were, in this war, and induced great numbers to attack both *Des Cartes* and *Cocceius*.

§ 30. The Cartesian philosophy, which at its first appearance was viewed by many, even in Holland, as preferable to the Peripatetic, was first assailed by *Gisbert Voet* in 1639, at Utrecht, where he taught theology with very great reputation, and who not obscurely condemned this philosophy as blasphemous. He was a man of immense reading and multifarious knowledge, but indifferently qualified to judge correctly on metaphysical and abstract subjects. While *Des Cartes* resided at Utrecht, *Voet* censured various opinions of his; but especially the following positions, he feared, were subversive of all religion; namely, that one who intends to be wise, must begin by calling everything in question, and even the existence of God: that the essence of *spirit*, and even of God himself, consists in *thought*: that *space*, in reality, has no existence, but is a mere fiction of the imagination; and, therefore, that *matter* is without bounds. *Des Cartes* first replied himself to the charges brought against him; and afterwards, his disciples afforded him aid. On the other hand, *Voet* was joined, not only by those Dutch theologians, who were then in the highest reputation for erudition and soundness in the faith, such as *Andrew Rivet*, *Maresius*, and *Van Mastricht*, but also by the greatest part of the clergy of inferior note.² To this flame, already raised too high, new fuel was added, when some of

¹ See Fred. Spanheim's *Epistola de Novissimis in Belgio Dissidiis*; Opp. tom. ii. p. 973, &c.

² Hadr. Baillet, *la Vie de M. des Cartes*, tom. ii. cap. v. p. 33, &c. Gabr. Daniel, *Voyage du Monde de M. des Cartes*; in his works, i. 84, &c. [Jac. Brucker's *Historia Crit. Philosophiæ*, t. iv. pt. ii. p. 222, &c. Irenæus Philalethes (Jac. Rhenford), *Kort en opreht Verhaal van de eerste Oorsprong der Broedertwisten*, Amsterd. 1708, 8vo. The first attack upon the philosophy of *Des Cartes* was made by *Gisbert Voet*, A.D. 1639, in his *Disputatio de Atheismo*. Samuel Maresius at first defended the cause of *Des Cartes* against *Voet*: but afterwards went over to the side of his adversaries. Even

Cocceius was at first opposed to *Des Cartes*, though his friend *Heidan* persuaded him to treat the name of *Des Cartes* respectfully in his writings. Peter van Mastricht, John Hornbeck, Andrew Essen, Melchior Leydecker, John Wayen, Gerhard Vries, James Revius, James Trigland, and Frederick Spanheim—manifestly great names—contended against *Des Cartes*. For him, there were among the philosophers, Henry Regius, James Golijs, Claudius Salmasius, Hadr. Heerebord, &c. and among the theologians, Abraham Heidan, Christopher Wittich, Francis Burmann, John Braun, John Clauberger, Peter Allinga, Balth. Bekker, Stephen Curcellæus, Herm. Alex. Roell, Ruard Andala, and others. *Schl.*]

the theologians applied the precepts of *Des Cartes* to the illustration of theological subjects. Hence, in the year 1656, the Dutch *Classes*, as they are called, or assemblies of the clergy in certain districts, resolved, that resistance ought to be made, and that this imperious philosophy ought not to be allowed to invade the territories of theology. By this decision the States of Holland were excited, in the same year, sternly to forbid, by a public law, the philosophers from expounding the books of *Des Cartes* to the youth, or explaining the Scriptures according to the dictates of philosophy. In a convention at Delft, the next year, it was resolved, that no person should be admitted to the sacred office without first solemnly promising that he would neither propagate Cartesian principles, nor deform revealed theology with adventitious ornaments. Similar resolutions were afterwards passed in various places, both in the United Provinces and out of them.¹ But, as mankind are always eager after what is forbidden, all these prohibitions could not prevent the Cartesian philosophy from finally obtaining a firm footing in the schools and universities, and from being applied, sometimes preposterously, by great numbers, to the illustration of divine truths. Hence the Dutch became divided into the two parties above named; and the rest of the century was spent amidst their perpetual contentions.

§ 31. *John Cocceius* (in German *Koch*), a native of Bremen, professor of theology in the university of Leyden, and unquestionably a great man, if he had only been able to regulate and temper with reason and judgment his erudition, his ingenuity, his reverence for the Holy Scriptures, and his piety, which he possessed in an eminent degree, introduced into theology not a little that was novel and unheard of before his times. In the first place, as has been already remarked, he interpreted the whole sacred volume in a manner very different from that of *Calvin* and all his followers. For he maintained that the entire history of the Old Testament presents a picture of the events that were to take place under the New Testament down to the end of the world; nay, more, that the things which Christ and his apostles did and suffered in this world were emblematic of future events. He moreover taught that the greatest part of the prophecies of the Jewish prophets foretell the fortunes of Christ and of the Christian church, not by means of the persons and things mentioned, but by the very sense of the words themselves. And, lastly, many of those passages in the Old Testament, which seem to contain nothing but the praises of Jehovah, or moral precepts and doctrines, he, with wonderful dexterity and ingenuity, converted into sacred enigmas, and predictions of future events. To give support and plausibility to these opinions, he first laid down this law of interpretation, that the language of the Bible *must* signify all that

¹ Fred. Spanheim, *de Novissimis in Belgio Dissidiis*; Opp. ii. 959, &c. Those who wish it, may also consult the common historians of this century, Arnold (*Kirchen- und Ketzehistorie*, vol. ii. book xvii. ch. x.

§ 1—6), Weismann (*Historia Eccles. sæc. xvii. p. 905*), Jaeger, Caroli, and also Waleh's *Einleitung in die Religionsstreitigkeiten ausser unsrer Kirche*, vol. iii.

it *can* signify: which rule, if adopted by a man of more genius than judgment, may give birth to very strange interpretations. In the next place, he distributed the entire history of the Christian church into seven portions of time, or *periods*, relying principally on the seven trumpets and seals of the *Apocalypse*.

§ 32. Theology itself, *Cocceius* judged, ought to be freed from the trammels of philosophy, and to be expounded only in scriptural phraseology. Hence, perceiving that the sacred writers denominate the method of salvation which God has prescribed, a *covenant* of God with men, he concluded that there could be no more suitable and pertinent analogy, according to which to adjust and arrange an entire system of theology. But while intent solely on accommodating and applying the principles of human covenants to divine subjects, he incautiously fell into some opinions which it is not easy to approve. For instance, he asserted that the covenant, which God made with the Hebrew nation, through the medium of *Moses*, did not differ in its nature from the new covenant procured by *Jesus Christ*. He supposed, that God caused the ten commandments to be promulgated by *Moses*, not as a *law* which was to be obeyed, but as one form of the covenant of *grace*. But, when the Hebrews had offended Him by various sins, and especially by the worship of the golden calf, God, being moved with just indignation, superadded to that moral law the yoke of the ceremonial law, to serve as a punishment. This yoke was in itself very burdensome, but it became much more painful in consequence of its import. For it continually admonished the Hebrews of their very imperfect, dubious, and anxious state, and was a kind of perpetual *memento*, that they merited the wrath of God, and that they could not anticipate a full expiation and remission of their sins, till the Messiah should come. Holy men, indeed, under the Old Testament, enjoyed eternal salvation after death; but while they lived, they were far from having that assurance of salvation, which is so comforting to us under the New Testament. For no sins were then actually forgiven, but only suffered to remain unpunished; because *Christ* had not yet offered up himself as a sacrifice to God, and therefore could not be regarded, before the divine tribunal, as one who has actually assumed our debt, but only as our surety. I omit other opinions of *Cocceius*. Those who assailed the Cartesian doctrines attacked also these opinions, in a fierce war, which was kept up for many years, with various success. The issue was the same as in the Cartesian contest. No device, and no force, could prevent the disciples of *Cocceius* from occupying many professorial chairs, and from propagating the opinions of their master, both orally and in writing, with wonderful celerity, even among the Germans and the Swiss.¹

§ 33. Nearly all the other controversies, which disquieted the Dutch

¹ The same writers may be consulted here, as were referred to before; for the Cartesian and Cocceian controversies were united in one. To these may be added,

Val. Alberti, *Διπλοὺν κἀππα, Cartesianismus et Cocceianismus descripti et refutati*. Lips. 1678, 4to.

churches in this century, arose from an excessive attachment to the Cartesian philosophy as connected with theology. This will appear from those commotions, greater than all others, produced by *Roel* and *Becker*. Certain Cartesian divines, at the head of whom was *Herman Alexander Roel*, a theologian of Franeker, a man of singular acuteness and perspicuity, were supposed, in the year 1686, to attribute too much to reason, in theology. Nearly the whole controversy was embraced in these two questions: I. Whether the divine origin and authority of the sacred books can be demonstrated by reason alone; or whether the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit is necessary, in order to a firm belief on this subject? II. Whether the Holy Scriptures propose anything to be believed by us, which is contrary to correct and sound reason? The first was affirmed and the second denied, not only by the above-named *Roel*, but also by *John van der Wayen*, *Gisbert Wessel*, *Duker*, *Ruard ab Andala*, and others: the contrary was maintained by *Ulrich Huber*, a jurist of great reputation, *Gerhard de Vries*, and others.¹ A great part of Belgium being now in a flame, the states of Friesland prudently interposed, and enjoined silence and peace on both the contending parties. Those who shall accurately investigate this cause, will, I think, perceive that a great part of it was a strife about words, and that the remainder of it might have been easily settled, if it had been stripped of its ambiguities.

§ 34. A little after this controversy had been hushed in a measure, the same *Roel*, in the year 1689, made himself thought a dangerous man to sound theology, by adopting some other singular opinions. These caused him to be viewed with no slight suspicion, not only by his colleagues, and particularly by *Campeius Vitringa*, but also by very many of the Dutch divines.² For he denied that the scriptural representations of the generation of the Son of God, are to be understood as denoting any natural generation; and maintained that the death of holy men, and the evils which they suffer in this life, equally with the calamities and death of the wicked, are the penal effects of the first sin; and he advanced some things respecting the divine decrees, original sin, the divine influence in regard to the sinful acts of men, the satisfaction made by Christ, and other subjects, which, either in reality, or at least in form and phraseology, differed much from the received opinions.³ The magistrates of Friesland published

¹ John le Clerc, *Biblioth. Universelle et Histor.* vi. 368.

² Concerning this extraordinary man, see the *Bibliotheca Bremensis Theologico-Philol.* t. ii. pt. vi. p. 707. Caspar Burmann's *Trajectum Eruditum*, p. 306, &c. [*Unpartheyische Kirchenhistorie*, Jena, 1735, 4to, ii. 620, &c. Tr.]

³ These errors may be best learned from a paper of the *Faculty of Theology at Leyden*, in which they confirm the sentence pronounced on them by the Dutch synods, entitled, *Judicium Ecclesiasticum, quo opi-*

niones quedam Cl. H. A. Roëllii Synodice damnatæ sunt, laudatæ a Professoribus Theologiæ in Academia Lugduno-Batava; Leyden, 1713, 4to, 20 sheets. [Roel maintained, that the title *Son of God* referred only to the human nature of Christ, and to the supernatural formation or conception of it, as also to his mediatorial office; and consequently, that it afforded no proof of his divinity. Yet in his later writings, he admitted, that Christ was also called the Son of God, on account of his eternal generation by the Father; yet without exclud-

decrees, which prevented these disputes from spreading in that province: but the rest of the Dutch, and especially those of the province of Holland, could not be restrained from condemning *Roel* and his disciples, both privately, and in their public conventions, as corruptors of divine truth.¹ Nor did this resentment die with the excellent man who was the object of it; but even to our times, the *Roëlians*, though they most solemnly protest their innocence, are thought by many to be infected with concealed heresies.

§ 35. *Balthazar Becker*, a minister of the Gospel at Amsterdam, from the Cartesian definition of a spirit, the truth of which he held to be unquestionable, took occasion to deny absolutely all that the Scriptures teach us respecting the works, snares, and power of the prince of darkness and his satellites, and also all the vulgar reports respecting ghosts, spectres, and witchcraft. There is extant a prolix and copious work of his, entitled *The World Bewitched*, first published in 1691; in which he perverts and explains away, with no little ingenuity, but with no less audacity, whatever the sacred volume relates, of persons possessed by evil spirits, and of the power of demons; and maintains, that the miserable being, whom the sacred writers call *Satan* and the *Devil*, together with his ministers, lies bound with everlasting chains in hell; so that he cannot thence go forth, to terrify mortals, and to plot against the righteous. *Des Cartes* placed the essence of spirit in *thinking*; but none of those acts, which are ascribed to evil spirits, can be effected by mere *thought*.² Therefore, lest the reputation of

ing the before-mentioned ground. In order to prove that the death of believers is a punishment, he maintained, that in justification, only *some* of the punishments of sin are remitted, and that the complete removal of them does not take place till after the resurrection. *Schl.*

¹ [It must not be inferred, from this statement of Mosheim, that *Roel* was excommunicated, deprived of his office, or even declared a heretic. Some of his *opinions* were condemned; but not the *man*. After serving as a chaplain to several noblemen, he was made professor, first of philosophy, and then of theology, at Franeker in Friesland, in 1686. In 1704, he was removed to the professorship of theology at Utrecht; where he died in office, A.D. 1718, aged 65. The states of Friesland enjoined upon him, in 1691, not to teach or preach his peculiar sentiments; they also enjoined upon his opposers, to keep silence on the same subjects. Both obeyed: so that in Friesland there was no more contention. But in the other Dutch provinces no such order was taken by the government: and therefore several synods, finding *Roel's* opinions to exist and to spread, passed orders of condemnation upon them; and decreed, that candidates should be required to renounce them, in order to their receiving licence. He was undoubtedly a great man. Hence

Mosheim calls him 'vir eximius.' He was also, in the main, sound in the faith. Yet on some points, he carried his speculations further than the spirit of the times would permit. But, like a good man, when he found his speculations to produce alarm and commotion, at the bidding of the magistrates, he forbore to urge them, and expended his efforts on subjects less offensive. *Tr.*]

² ['Our historian relates here, somewhat obscurely, the reasoning which Becker founded upon the Cartesian definition of mind or spirit. The tenor and amount of his argument is as follows: "The essence of mind is *thought*, and the essence of matter is *extension*. Now, since there is no sort of conformity or connexion between a *thought* and *extension*, mind cannot act upon matter unless these two substances be united, as soul and body are in man:—therefore no separate spirits, either good or evil, can act upon mankind. Such acting is miraculous, and miracles can be performed by God alone. It follows of consequence, that the Scripture accounts of the actions and operations of good and evil spirits must be understood in an allegorical sense."—This is Becker's argument; and it does, in truth, little honour to his acuteness and sagacity. By proving too much, it proves nothing at all; for if the want of a connexion or con-

Des Cartes should be impaired, the narrations and decisions of the divine books must be accommodated to his opinion. This error not only disquieted all the United Provinces, but likewise induced not a few Lutheran divines to gird on their armour.¹ Its author, although confuted by vast numbers, and deprived of his ministerial office, yet, on his dying bed, in 1718, continued to affirm, until his last breath, that he believed all that he had written to be true. Nor did his new

formity between thought and extension renders mind incapable of acting upon matter, it is hard to see how their union should remove this incapacity, since the want of conformity and connexion remains notwithstanding this union. Besides, according to this reasoning, the Supreme Being cannot act upon material beings. In vain does Becker maintain the affirmative, by having recourse to a miracle; for this would imply, that the whole course of nature was a series of miracles, that is to say, that there are no miracles at all.' *Macl.*]

¹ See Michael Lilienthal's *Selecta Histor. Litterar.* pt. i. Observ. ii. p. 17, &c., *Miscellanea Lipsiens.* i. 361, 364, where there is a description of a medal, struck in reference to Becker, and the other writers, whom we have often quoted. *Nouveau Diction. Hist. et Crit.* i. 193. [Balthazar Becker, D.D., was born near Gröningen, 1634; educated there and at Franeker; made rector of the Latin school in the latter place, a preacher, a doctor of divinity; and lastly, a pastor at Amsterdam, where he died in 1718. This learned man published three Catechisms; in the last of which, 1670, he taught, that Adam, if he had not sinned, would have been immortal, by virtue of the fruits of the tree of life; questioned, whether endless punishment (which he placed in horror and despair) was consistent with the goodness of God; and admitted episcopacy to be the most ancient and customary form of church government. These sentiments exposed him to some animadversion. In 1680 he published a book, in proof that *comets* are not ominous. In his sermons he had often intimated that too much was ascribed to the agency of the devil; and being frequently questioned on the subject, he concluded to give the world his full views on the whole subject. This he did in his Dutch work, entitled *Betoverde Wereld*, &c. i.e. *The World Bewitched*, or a critical investigation of the commonly received opinion respecting spirits, their nature, power, and acts, and all those extraordinary feats, which men are said to perform, through their aid; in four books, Amsterd. 1691, 4to. In the preface, he says, 'It is come to that, at the present day, that it is almost regarded as a part of religion, to ascribe great wonders to the devil;

and those are taxed with infidelity and perverseness, who hesitate to believe what thousands relate concerning his power. It is now thought essential to piety, not only to fear God, but also to fear the devil. Whoever does not do so, is accounted an atheist; because he cannot persuade himself that there are two gods, the one good and the other evil.' He also gives a challenge to the devil: 'If he is a god, let him defend himself: let him lay hold of me: for I throw down his altars. In the name of the God of hosts, I fight with this Goliath: we will see, who can deliver him.' In the *first* Book, he states the opinions of the pagans, concerning gods, spirits, and demons: and shows, that both Jews and Christians have derived their prejudices on this subject from them. In the *second*, he shows, what reason and Scripture teach concerning spirits: and in the *third*, confutes the believers in witchcraft and confederacies with the devil. In the *fourth* Book, he answers the arguments alleged from experience, to prove the great power of the devil. He founds his doctrine on two grand principles; that, from their very nature, spirits cannot act upon material beings; and that the Scriptures represent the devil and his satellites, as shut up in the prison of hell. To explain away the texts which militate against his system, evidently costs him much labour and perplexity. His interpretations, for the most part, are similar to those still relied on by the believers in his doctrine. Becker was not the first writer who published such opinions. Before him were Arnold Geulinx, of Leyden, who died in 1669; and Daillon, a French Reformed preacher, who fled to London, and there published his views, in 1687. But these advanced their opinions problematically; while Becker advanced his in a positive tone. He also discussed the whole subject; and he mingled wit and sarcasm with his arguments. This difference caused his book to awaken very great attention; while theirs passed unheeded. Becker was deposed and silenced, by the synods of Edam and Alkmaar, in 1692. But the senate of Amsterdam continued to him his salary, till his death, in 1718. See Schroeckh, *Kirchengesch. s. d. Reformation*, viii. 713, &c. *Tr.*]

doctrine die with him; but it still has very many defenders, both open and concealed.

§ 36. It is well known that various sects, some of them Christian, others semi-Christian, and others manifestly delirious, not unfrequently start up and are cherished, in Holland as well as England. But it is not easy for any one, who does not reside in those parts of the world, to give a correct account of them; because the books which contain the necessary information, seldom find their way into foreign countries. Yet the Dutch sects of *Verschorists* and *Haltemists* having now for some time been better known among us, I shall here give some account of them. The former derived their name from *James Verschoor*, of Flushing, who, about the year 1680, is said to have so strangely mixed together the principles of *Spinoza* and *Cocceius*, as out of them to have produced a new system of religion, which was quite absurd and impious. His followers are also called *Hebrews*; because they all, both men and women, bestow great attention on the Hebrew language. The latter sect, about the same time, had for its leader *Pontianus van Hattem*, a minister of the Gospel at Philipsland in Zealand, who was also an admirer of *Spinoza*, and was afterwards deprived of his office, on account of his errors. These two sects were akin to each other; and yet they must have differed in some way, since *Van Hattem* could never persuade the *Verschorists* to enter into alliance with him. Neither of them wished to be looked upon as abandoning the Reformed religion: and *Hattem* wrote an exposition of the *Heidelberg Catechism*. If I understand correctly the not very lucid accounts given us of their doctrines, the founders of both sects, in the first place, inferred, from the Reformed doctrine of the absolute decrees of God, this principle, that whatever takes place, necessarily and unavoidably takes place. Assuming this as true, they denied that men are by nature wicked or corrupt; and that human actions are some of them good, and others bad. Hence they inferred, that men need not trouble themselves about a change of heart, nor be solicitous to obey the divine law; that religion does not consist in *acting*, but in *suffering*; and that Jesus Christ inculcated this only, that we patiently and cheerfully endure whatever, by the good pleasure of God, occurs or befalls us, striving only to keep our minds tranquil. *Hattem*, in particular, taught that Jesus Christ did not by his death appease the divine justice, nor expiate the sins of men; but that He signified to us, that there was nothing in us which could offend God, and in this way He made us just. These things appear to be perverse, and inimical to all virtue: and yet neither of these men—unless I am wholly deceived—was so beside himself, as to recommend iniquity; or to suppose, that a person may safely follow his lusts. At least, the sentiment ascribed to them, that *God punishes men by their sins, not for them*, seems to carry this import: That unless a person bridles his lusts, he must suffer punishment, both in this life and in that to come; yet not by a divine infliction, or by the sovereign will and pleasure of God, but by some law of nature.¹ Both

¹ See Theodore Haseus, *Dissert. in the Museum Bremense Theol. Philol.* ii. 144,

sects still exist; but have discarded the names derived from their founders.

§ 37. The churches of Switzerland, from the year 1669, were in great fear, lest the religion handed down to them by their fathers, and confirmed at the synod of Dort, should be contaminated with the doctrines, already mentioned, of the French divines, *Amyraut*, *De la Place*, and *Capell*. For there were at that time, among the associated ministers of Geneva, certain men, distinguished both for their eloquence and their erudition, who not only approved those doctrines, but also endeavoured, against the will of their colleagues, to induce others to embrace them.¹ To restrain the efforts of these men, the principal divines of Switzerland, in the year 1675, had a book drawn up by *John Henry Heidegger*, a very celebrated divine of Zurich, in opposition to the new doctrines of the French; and with no great difficulty, they persuaded the magistrates to annex it, by public authority, to the common Helvetic formulas of religion. It is usually called the *Formula Consensus*. But this measure, which was intended to secure peace, became rather the fruitful source of contentions and disturbance. For many declared, that they could not conscientiously assent to this *Formula*: and hence pernicious commotions arose in some places. In consequence of these, the canton of Bern and the republic of Geneva, at the urgent solicitation of *Frederic William* of Brandenburg, in the year 1686, abrogated the *Formula Consensus*.² In the other cantons, it with difficulty retained its authority somewhat longer: but in our age, having given birth to the most violent quarrels, particularly in the University of Lausanne, it began to sink in them also, and to lose nearly all its influence.³

&c. *Wilh. Goeree, Kerkelyke and Wereldlyke Historie*, Leyd. 1729, 4to. *Bibliothèque Belgique*, ii. 203, &c.

¹ See Greg. Leti's *Istoria Genevrina*, pt. iv. lib. v. p. 448, 488, 497, &c.

² [It must not be imagined, from this expression of our historian, that this *Form*, entitled the *Consensus*, was abrogated at Basil by a positive edict. The case stood thus: Mr. Peter Werenfels, who was at the head of the Consistory of that city, paid such regard to the letter of the Elector, as to avoid requiring a subscription to this *Form* from the candidates for the ministry; and his conduct, in this respect, was imitated by his successors. The remonstrances of the Elector do not seem to have had the same effect upon those that governed the church of Geneva; for the *Consensus*, or *Form of agreement*, maintained its credit and authority there until 1706, when, without being abrogated by any positive act, it fell into disuse. In several other parts of Switzerland, it was still imposed as a rule of faith, as appears by the letters addressed by George I. king of England, as also by the king of Prussia, in 1723, to the Swiss Cantons, in order to procure the abrogation

of this *Form*, or *Consensus*, which was considered as an obstacle to the union of the Reformed and Lutheran churches.] *Macl.*

³ See Christ. Matth. Pfaff's *Schediasma de Formula Consensus Helvetica*, Tübing. 1723, 4to. *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire des Troubles arrivés en Suisse à l'occasion du Consensus*; Amsterd. 1726, 8vo. [In this *Formula Consensus* (which, like the Lutheran *Formula Concordia*, might better be called *Formula Dissensus*), four controversies, which had previously disquieted the Reformed churches, were decided. It condemned, I. the doctrines of Moses Amyraut, respecting general grace, and established the most strenuous opinion of special grace. It condemned, II. the opinion of Joshua Placcæus (de la Place), respecting the imputation of Adam's sin: III. Piscator's doctrine, concerning the active obedience of Christ; and IV. Lewis Capell's critical doctrine, concerning the points of the Hebrew text. This *Formula*, so long as subscription to it was rigorously enforced, deprived the Swiss churches of many a worthy divine, who would rather quit his country, than violate his conscience. Sulzer of Berlin was a remarkable example. *Schl.*]

CHAPTER III.

*HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

§ 1. Appointment of the arch-priest—§ 2. Primacy of Abp. Bancroft—§ 3. English concurrence in the synod of Dort—§ 4. The Lambeth Articles formally admitted by the Church of Ireland—§ 5. Progress of Puritanism under Charles I.—§ 6. Ecclesiastical affairs in Scotland—§ 7. Proceedings of the Long Parliament—§ 8. Cromwell—§ 9. Ecclesiastical affairs in Ireland—§ 10. The Savoy Conference—§ 11. Restoration of Protestant episcopacy in Ireland—§ 12. Self-taxation relinquished by the English clergy.—§ 13. Penal religious Acts under Charles II.—§ 14. James II.—§ 15. The Toleration Act—§ 16. Ineffectual attempt at a comprehension—§ 17. Overthrow of established Protestant episcopacy in Scotland—§ 18. The Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement.

§ 1. AT the close of the sixteenth century Romanism acquired a new hold upon England, by the institution of a qualified species of episcopacy. The last survivor of that prelacy which Elizabeth deprived, was Watson, whose inconformity forfeited the see of Lincoln. He died in 1584. The Romish party then looked up to Allen, afterwards cardinal, as its leader, and it formed a body sufficiently united, until his death, in 1594. Serious disagreements then arose. The Jesuits had gained a paramount ascendancy over the wealthy Romish families, which the secular priests, many of whom were far advanced in years, and had been but little tainted by politics, viewed with envy and disgust. It was thought likely, that greater unanimity would be found attainable, if a bishop, or more bishops than one, were appointed, who might serve as a common centre of authority. But such a functionary would have opportunities for consolidating an influence over the Romish aristocracy, which Persons dreaded, as a probable obstacle to his plan of excluding James from the succession. That restless and intriguing Jesuit, accordingly, who was chiefly consulted at Rome upon English affairs, recommended eventually the appointment of an ecclesiastical superior, with a character something inferior to the prelatic.¹ George Blackwell was, in consequence, nominated *Arch-priest*, with the pope's approbation, but not formally by his appointment.² Apparently, the new arch-priest was quite independent of the Jesuits; but really, secret instructions bound him to a dependence upon Garnet, the provincial of their order. Thus Persons gained by management a reasonable prospect of that influence over the English Romanists, which had been the object of his life, and

* By Mr. SOAMES.

¹ 'Father Robert Persons, an English Jesuit, was the chief person in credit at Rome, after the cardinal's' (Allen's) 'decease, and commonly advised with in all

matters relating to the English nation.' (Dodd's *Ch. Hist.* Lond. 1840, iii. 45.) Persons had originally approved of the episcopate.

² In 1598

which he hoped to render highly effective when the queen's demise should embolden competition for the throne. The secular priests of England were highly dissatisfied with Blackwell's appointment, viewing it, in its true light, as a Jesuitic engine to depress them. But they submitted on the pontiff's formal approval of Blackwell's appointment, in 1599, and English Romanism was placed under the superintendence of three arch-priests in succession. Thus was formed, as the seventeenth century opened, a compact, organised body, which has weathered every storm, and now assumes a tone to which England has been quite unused from Roman Catholics ever since the days of James II.¹

§ 2. The church of England gained some advantages under James I., by the authorised compilation of a body of canons, a restraint upon the conveyance of ecclesiastical estates to the crown, otherwise than as a lessee on the ordinary terms, an increased strictness in exacting subscription from the clergy, and the completion of that version of Scripture, which has been authorised ever since. The canons were enacted by the convocation of the province of Canterbury, in the spring of 1604, Bancroft, then bishop of London, being president, Abp. Whitgift having lately died. Their number is 141, and they were chiefly collected from the various articles, injunctions, and synodical acts which appeared under Edward VI. and Elizabeth. They were adopted by the province of York, and authorised by the crown, but never sanctioned by parliament. Hence the Court of King's Bench has unanimously pronounced them no further binding upon the laity than they may embody the provisions of common or statute law. They have, however, served to direct the proceedings of ecclesiastical courts, and although fallen into desuetude in various particulars, they continue down to the present day of considerable use in preserving one uniform face to the national church. By rendering illegal the transfer of ecclesiastical estates to the crown, James conferred a great boon upon the church.² His predecessor had seriously impaired the resources of the dignified clergy by the powers which she obtained, at the outset of her reign, for effecting exchanges, as they were called, with such as obtained high preferments in the church. Such powers, in the hands of James, from his extreme facility, and the rapacious importunity displayed by some of his personal favourites, especially those from Scotland, must have proved, in a few years, highly detrimental to the endowments which former covetousness had spared. He deserves, therefore, the respectful remembrance of those who value a church establishment, able to hold a high intellectual position, and to support liberally objects worthy of patronage, for consenting, in the very beginning of his power, to limit it in a point liable to so much abuse. The increased strictness in pressing subscription came from the anxiety to repress irregularities entertained by Bancroft,

¹ See Mr. Tierney's notes to the new edition of Dodd.

² By the 13th Eliz. the subject had been

disabled from accepting grants of church estates. Fuller, b. x. p. 27.

who had been translated to Canterbury within the year of Whitgift's death. He incurred thereby great odium among the Puritanical party, and its admirers have not forgiven him to the present day. But it is impossible to arraign his conduct in this, with any degree of fairness. Nothing can be more unreasonable, than to take the bread provided by an establishment which the recipient is bent upon undermining, or even upon remodelling according to his own private views; and really, pleas of conscience come from such a person with a very ill grace. Abp. Bancroft, however, has not only been very severely blamed for his conduct towards such persons, but also the number of them who suffered under him has been invidiously exaggerated. By the rolls delivered in by him, not long before his death, it appears that only forty-nine clergymen were deprived on any account whatever. This is no great number when we consider the inveteracy of the evil with which he had to contend, and that it was spread over more than nine thousand parishes.¹ He might, indeed, have frightened some clergymen into a conformity to which they were unused, and for which they were disinclined. Such men may complain of hardship, as they will, to justify their previous conduct: they have evidently very slender claims upon the sympathy of others. The primate's care in this matter of subscription, was attended with immediate results of considerable importance. A degree of uniformity, and of attention to rubrical formalities, long unknown, became general,² and probably, if the times had not grown all but irresistibly Puritanical, Bancroft's reforms might have immediately taken a permanent hold upon the church. The new translation of Scripture he did not live to see completed. A commission for executing it issued in 1604, but the work was not formally begun until 1607, and it did not appear in print until 1611. The divines employed upon it were in number forty-seven, and they were divided into six committees, each with its task, which met in Westminster, and in the two Universities.³ In this body were included many scholars of unquestionable competence, and as their labours were conducted with extreme deliberation, the result could hardly fail of being, as it has been found, worthy of an enlightened nation's confidence. No version, that has been scrupulously prepared, of originals so ancient, various, and extensive, can be absolutely free from obscurities, and inaccuracies are found in all versions; but upon the whole, the authorised English version of Holy Scripture is remarkably free from both, and forms, perhaps, the best vernacular Bible that any country has to boast.

§ 3. In one respect, James rendered a service to the Puritanical party. The members of it embraced universally those high Calvinistic opinions, which Perkins had unfolded about the close of the last century, in his *Armillæ Aurea*, with a degree of systematic skill that no earlier work on the same side could boast.⁴ Van Harmin, or Arminius,

¹ Collier, ii. 687.

² *Ibid.*

³ Fuller, b. x. p. 45, 57.

⁴ Heylin's *Quinquarticular History*, Tracts, Lond. 1681, p. 615.

aroused by the popularity of this author,¹ made a formal attack upon his theory,² and the disgust which was occasioned among continental Predestinarians by such an examination of their doctrine was loudly echoed by the English Puritans. The king expressed himself, on some occasions, as warmly against the anti-Calvinistic party, as any of his subjects could desire : having even been heard to brand Arminius as *the enemy of God*.³ Nor when the Dutch, embarrassed by the fury with which these disputes were conducted, and their increasing adaptation to political purposes, convened the synod of Dort, did James decline his countenance, but sent over some British divines to assist at its deliberations. As the Arminian party was hardly represented at all in that famous assembly,⁴ the decisions could not fail of being such as Calvinists approved. Hence they were highly agreeable to the Puritanical portion of James's subjects, and had his conduct been invariably answerable to the part taken by him at Dort, he must have been popular with all that busy part of the nation. He had, indeed, already promoted George Abbot to the see of Canterbury; a prelate whom Puritanical predilections rendered extremely popular, and who undid much that had been done by his predecessor, Bancroft, in exacting clerical conformity.⁵ But, on the other hand, James had resisted, at Hampton Court, an attempt to impose the Lambeth articles, and had raised anti-Calvinistic clergymen to many of the first preferments.⁶ Upon the whole, therefore, he proved anything rather than a promoter of the Puritanical cause; except inasmuch as he alternately irritated and encouraged its warmest abettors. Thus were effectually sown the seeds, which grew so vigorously in the next reign, and eventually ripened in the general overthrow of English institutions.

§ 4. In Ireland, undoubtedly, James not merely allowed, but even formally sanctioned, a step in favour of Puritanism, which must have proved of considerable importance, had not Romanism been so much master of the country as to paralyse every Protestant movement. The established church there was, indeed, in a most deplorable condition, the pillage of benefices, from the bishop down to the vicar, having reached such an intolerable height, as placed serious difficulties in the way of maintaining the established worship.⁷ Much of the Protestantism also which succeeded in rooting itself was adverse to the Anglican church. The province of Ulster had become, in a great

¹ 'It was printed several times after the Latin edition, with the general approbation of the French and Belgic churches, and no less than fifteen times within the space of twenty years in the English tongue.' Heylin's *Quinquart. Hist. Tracts*, 615.

² In his *Examen Predestinationis Perkinsane*. *Ibid.* 616.

³ *Ibid.* 534.

⁴ 'The national synod of Dort consisted of thirty-eight Dutch and Walloon divines, five professors of the universities, and twenty-one lay elders, making together

sixty-one persons, of which not above three or four were Remonstrants (Arminians).' Neal, i. 465.

⁵ 'With whom' (Bancroft) 'died the uniformity of the church of England.' Heylin's *Laud*, Lond. 1668, p. 62.

⁶ 'By which encouragements, the anti-Calvinians, or old English Protestants, took heart again, and more openly declared themselves than they had done formerly.' Heylin's *Quinquart. Hist. Tracts*, 631.

⁷ Bramhall to Laud, Aug. 10, 1633 Collier, ii. 760.

measure, denuded of its old proprietors and inhabitants, by means of the rebellions under Elizabeth. The vacancies thus made were partly filled up by bodies of colonists fitted out by the city of London, but still more by emigrants from Scotland. These last brought over all those violent Puritanical prepossessions that had occasioned so many fierce struggles at home.¹ Thus that portion of the island which seemed likely to be first in a general acceptance of the Reformation, was prejudiced against any view of Protestant principles that could not plead a recommendation from Geneva. Among the established clergy, James Ussher, eventually primate, was by far the most learned, and in consequence his opinion carried great weight. He had, however, espoused heartily that system of theology which the study of Calvin's *Institutes* made a large portion of contemporary Protestant divines regard as unquestionably true. The operation of these causes came strikingly before the world in 1615. The Irish convocation, under Ussher's influence, then incorporated the Lambeth Articles with others of a Puritanical character, in a body of doctrine which clergymen were to subscribe. This variation from the English terms of conformity was ratified by the lord deputy Chichester, in the king's name. It was, however, soon found unseemly and inconvenient, to exact in Ireland a subscription different from that imposed in England. Accordingly, in 1635, the Irish convocation adopted the English thirty-nine Articles.² No debate was allowed as to the abrogation of the Irish Articles of 1615. It was rather meant, that such as considered them mere amplifications of the English formulary, might enjoy that opinion unmolested, and some of the Irish prelacy, accordingly, exacted subscriptions to both sets of articles, down to the time of the troubles of 1641. But it was found impossible to obtain the lord deputy's permission to bring the ratification of the Irish articles before parliament. It was evidently intended by the government, that this variation between the two churches should gradually and silently sink into desuetude. Such was its fate. The Irish articles dragged on a lingering and precarious existence during some six years after the convocation of 1635; but when the restoration of Charles II. again established the church of Ireland, subscription to them wholly ceased.³

§ 5. Under Charles I. Puritanism rapidly increased, and undoubtedly, the church herself, by several gross mistakes, powerfully aided its growth. An extreme antipathy, indeed, to popery, and to every external observance which seemed anyway connected with it, might have yielded to time, a conscientious exercise of patronage, and judicious management. Moderate men might thus have learned to discriminate between the encouragement of unscriptural opinions, and a prudent connivance at them; between mere externals and fundamental principles. Nor, in some respects, were the courses taken

¹ Collier, ii. 708.

² 'With the single dissentient voice of a

non-conformist minister from the diocese of Down.' Mant, 491.

³ *Ibid.* 495.

adverse to this desirable consummation. The church was active, and promotion commonly followed upon the heels of proved ability. But unhappily, with professional ability, in the high-church party, was usually combined a discreditable, unconstitutional, and pernicious political subserviency. This too early took exactly that form which arouses the fiercest opposition: it was arrayed against men's pockets. Charles was involved, at the outset of his reign, in foreign war, and found himself under a pressure of pecuniary difficulty, which his father's pacific policy and Elizabeth's parsimony had avoided.¹ To relieve his necessities, in all the confidence of well-intentioned youth, he frankly reckoned upon parliament. But he encountered within its walls a rancorous hatred of his favourite Buckingham, and a determination to grapple with prerogative. Surprised and irritated, he tried hasty dissolutions, although the exchequer still continued empty. To replenish it, he had recourse to a general loan, as it was called; really, to a regular levy upon the people, according to their several assessments under the last subsidy; but in this case the call came without any previous consent from the people's representatives. Fiscal exactions are always very far from welcome; they little, therefore, need an accession of unpopularity from such a title as may make them pass for an extortion, which every Englishman was entitled, if not bound, to resist. In order to lessen the public discontent, all clergymen were required to recommend the loan, and some of them, disreputably eager for preferment, broached from the pulpit the most obnoxious doctrines.² Passive obedience was nakedly advocated upon scriptural grounds; a line of teaching which made it easy to argue, that the crown was fully justified in relieving its just necessities by levying money on the bare strength of prerogative, and that Christians, by resistance, were infringing a religious obligation. Mainwaring and Sibthorp, the two chief inculcators of these absurd and illegal doctrines, were both censured by parliament, and the former was visited with all that vindictive violence, which offended power in those times, wherever lodged, invariably displayed.³ But the court contemptuously nullified the vengeance of the commons, by not only pardoning, but also rewarding the victims. Mainwaring found the storm a speedy passport to a good country living, and eventually to a mitre; Sibthorp obtained better parochial preferment, and a prebend of Peterborough.⁴ Thus moderate men were prejudiced against distinguished ecclesiastics, by seeing the exceptionable access which had led individuals among them to preferment, and by the offensive political leaven which was likely from self-interest to blend itself with their principles. Mere theology was another ground of distinction and unpopularity to the higher clergy. They were generally of the party

¹ Hallam's *Const. Hist.* c. vii. t. i. p. 512.

² The instructions to the clergy were framed by Laud, then bishop of Bath and Wells, at the king's desire. The purport of them may be seen in Collier, ii. 739.

³ He was to be imprisoned during the

pleasure of the House, fined 1,000*l.*, make a prescribed submission, be suspended for three years, rendered incapable of further preferment, and of preaching at court.

⁴ Kennet's *Hist. Engl.* ii. 28. Mainwaring was made bishop of St. David's.

branded as Arminian ; while the more strenuous opponents of unparliamentary taxation and of an overstrained prerogative, were usually Calvinists. In the same quarter, too, a greater point was made of maintaining that strict and mortified exterior which readily gains upon serious minds, especially in lower life. Popularity among the gayer majority of that condition was indeed sought on the other side in 1633, by a royal proclamation, generally known as the *Book of Sports*, allowing lawful recreations out of the hours of service, on Sundays, to such as had duly attended church.¹ Many were, no doubt, pleased by this authoritative relaxation of the rigorous principles by which Puritanism was everywhere curtailing the immemorial enjoyments of a rustic Sunday. But more, or, at all events, more of any influence, were seriously offended. The *Book of Sports* gave a colourable opening for painting the court and hierarchy as leagued against all godliness. Puritanism, therefore, gained upon public opinion, not only as the honourable opponent of royal extortion, but also as the uncompromising teacher of sound religion.

§ 6. Still, in spite of these advantages, and of many things done injudiciously, some reprehensibly, by the ruling party, there is no reason to believe that Presbyterianism would have superseded episcopacy, if English discontent had not urgently needed Scottish assistance. Nor is it by any means improbable that even Scotland would have risen superior to an uninquiring horror of prelacy, had a calm view of its merits and operation been permitted. Popular hatred of bishops and liturgies had grown out of times when prelates and service-books were abused by Popery. Undoubtedly, a poverty-stricken, covetous aristocracy, keenly alive to the advantage of securing for itself the endowments by which they had been supported, was interested in keeping up the prejudice against them. Nor was it possible, when James again planted prelacy in his paternal kingdom, to prevent a sour, envious hostility towards wealthy churchmen from arising among those who moved in humble and necessitous conditions. All such feelings, however, if left to themselves, would have gradually dwindled down to their average intensity : which is not sufficient for convulsing a nation. They were driven from this even tenor, and consequently shielded from unimportance, by extraneous forces. Charles not only desired an uniform religious system to be established in all parts of his dominions ; he was also anxious that the northern prelacy and clergy should be provided, like their southern neighbours, with adequate endowments. He therefore announced intentions of resuming grants of ecclesiastical estates, and of placing the tithe-property upon a footing more advantageous to the church.² Such announcements filled many of the best houses with dismay, and rendered their masters anxious to fan the embers of popular prejudice against prelacy. The king's conduct also gave a great advantage to the Presbyterian party, from its rash contempt of constitutional forms. It was desirable that Scotland should possess a body of canon law. One

¹ Collier, ii. 578.

² Russell, ii. 116.

was compiled ; but Charles was so ill advised, as to fancy that it needed no higher authority than his own. It came before the country, therefore, not as the fruits of recognised ecclesiastical deliberation, duly sanctioned afterwards by the civil power, but as the mere creature of some private consultations among the Scottish prelates, revised by their English brethren, which the sovereign was to render valid by the strength of prerogative. To make this unhappy assumption more popularly odious, one of the canons which it promulged, bound the people to use the liturgy : when, in fact, no liturgy had hitherto been provided. Thus, when one actually appeared, so great a storm of popular fury was found ready to burst upon it, as evidently occasioned general surprise in superior life.¹ As an extenuation of the king's imprudence in thus acting upon the strength of an ill-defined prerogative, may be mentioned the High Commission Court, which his father had established in the same illegal way nearly thirty years before.² But this precedent only served to mislead him and increase his difficulties. When the popular explosion burst forth with irresistible force, that arbitrary court was one of the first things which the government found itself under the necessity of offering to modify. This offer was accompanied with another to suspend the canons and liturgy until they should have duly passed the ordeal of constitutional forms. But it was now too late for qualified concessions on the royal side. For a long time Scottish discontent seemed only an ebullition of vulgar fanaticism, its abettors in superior life having abstained from compromising themselves by an open participation in it. But soon after the liturgical tumult in Edinburgh, in the summer of 1637, the strength of the Presbyterian party became so conspicuous, that great men thought themselves quite safe in heading it, and in the following year the famous *Covenant* was enthusiastically adopted by people of all conditions. It was not, indeed, accepted with equal eagerness in every part of the kingdom. On the contrary, the northern Scots received, at first, invitations to join it with considerable coolness.³ But gradually their objections were overcome by the fervid representations which resounded from Edinburgh and its neighbourhood. Thus, in the course of a short time, the whole kingdom inbibed a persuasion, that adherence to the *Covenant* was imperative upon every Scotchman who valued either his country or his salvation. It was vain for Charles to hope that his tardy concessions could stem such a raging torrent. Nothing was any longer thought of among his countrymen, but an unconditional surrender of all that haunted inferior life with fears of religious pollution, and superior, with hateful visions of tithes and church lands again required for church purposes. The country, however, being thoroughly united and marshalled under its hereditary heads, did not supinely rest upon an enthusiastic

¹ 'Even in Edinburgh, at that time the focus of insurrection, only one clergyman was hostile to the liturgy.' Russell, ii. 136.

² James's instructions for the regulation of this court, may be seen in Collier, ii. 792.

³ 'Especially at Aberdeen, where it was opposed with much ability by the clergymen and professors of that city.' Russell, ii. 144.

resolution. It took the field, and remained in a formidable military attitude, in spite of royal endeavours on the other side, until its objects were completely gained amidst the ruins of the falling monarchy. Thus, when a revolutionary English party committed itself irreconcilably against the throne, it had an ally provided within the island, and without co-operation from that quarter, its own success appeared highly problematical. That co-operation, however, to any sufficient extent, was unattainable, unless England would embrace the Presbyterian system. Thus, really, the southern church, although rendered unpopular from several causes, owed its actual fall to the exigencies of desperate politicians, then uppermost in the country. Had they thought themselves able to dispense with aid from Scotland, English episcopacy might have been purged by the national troubles, instead of overthrown.

§ 7. When, accordingly, the famous *Long Parliament* met,¹ although it manifested from the first a rancorous hatred of the primate and others of his order, with a determination to reduce all clergymen so as to satisfy democratical views of their inferiority and Puritanical notions of clerical efficiency, yet it evidently was not pervaded for some time with any determination to supersede an episcopal polity by a presbyterian. On the third day of the session was, indeed, appointed a committee of the whole house to take cognisance of religion, which, within a month, gave birth to a sub-committee ‘for providing preaching ministers, and removing scandalous ones.’² But this proved very much of an engine for the selfish purposes of party politicians. Even among the unhappy clergymen, stigmatised as ‘scandalous,’ many were, probably, rather offensive to their enemies by hostility to the tide of revolution than by any fair objections to their personal habits. The bulk, however, of those whom this committee visited with ruin, really could be charged with little solid or important, besides *malignancy*, a compendious term of reproach which merely meant affection to the monarch and hatred of his oppressors.³ Thus, if the more moderate portion of the House of Commons had seen a reasonable prospect of succeeding, without extraneous aid, in reducing the regal power within satisfactory limits, and the violent encroaching spirits of the house had been likely to secure, by English means alone, sufficient gratifications for their own pride and cupidity, the church might have kept her liturgy, and some sort of bishops. With the former, indeed, it probably would have been rendered allowable to mingle extemporaneous prayers, and the latter, undoubtedly, must have descended to a level endurable by envious insolence, and must have been rearranged so as to place considerable pecuniary advantages within reach of party leaders. But Charles proved an enemy that often bade fair to baffle the Parliament, and hence its

¹ Nov. 3, 1640.

² ‘The bare convening of a clergyman before the committee (and this was always in the power of the meanest and most profligate parishioner to do) was sufficient to

give him the character of a *scandalous minister*.’ Walker’s *Sufferings of the Clergy*, Lond. 1714, p. 64.

³ ‘Few or none of the loyal clergy escaped the lash.’ *Ibid*.

more violent members were unable to escape many hours of uneasiness, if not of despondence. The Scots were, therefore, felt of vital importance to turn the scale, and nothing would satisfy that fanatical abhorrence of episcopacy, which drove them into war, short of English adhesion to their vaunted covenant.

§ 8. When this was formally imposed upon the nation, in 1643, it became a new instrument for ejecting the clergy from their benefices, and by its means the ruling party involved in ruin such obnoxious members of the clerical body as had hitherto avoided spoliation. A fifth of their livings might, indeed, be reserved for the future subsistence of their wives and families, but loud complaints were made as to evasions of an obligation to pay this pittance.¹ The triumphant party, however, which showed this degree of regard for the maintenance of helpless dependents upon despoiled incumbents, showed none to their religious prepossessions. In 1645, the use of the liturgy was prohibited, even in private houses, under a penalty of five pounds, and thus the church of England was, equally with that of Rome, denied any toleration.² Under this prohibition it continued until the Restoration, the army, which insisted upon toleration for Protestant sectarianism, having nothing but hatred for the principles of that religious establishment which recent troubles had subverted. Nevertheless, episcopal clergymen of talent continually came before the public in ways favourable to the ultimate success of their order, though not immediately connected with it. In particular, the London Polyglott appeared under Cromwell, being completed near the end of the year 1657. The Protector allowed paper for it to be imported duty free,³ and seems to have wished that the work should be dedicated to himself. Yet its editor was that well-known scholar, Brian Walton, eventually bishop of Chester, who had made himself obnoxious to the revolutionary party, and had been stripped of his preferments by it. Cromwell also claims the distinction of a ready attention to Protestant distress, wherever it might occur. Not only did he interpose the irresistible weight of his authority, when the petty court of Turin turned anew the tide of persecution upon its Waldensian subjects, but also the powerful monarchy of France was alive to the imprudence of disregarding him when he remonstrated against oppressions inflicted upon the unfortunate Huguenots in the south of that kingdom.⁴ If we might implicitly believe dissenting authorities, the Protectorate, and the years immediately bordering upon it, were likewise the season when England was much more virtuous and religious than at any other time.⁵ But some of the virtues,

¹ Fuller, b. xi. p. 230.

² Walker's *Sufferings of the Clergy*, p. 28.

³ 'A similar privilege was conceded to the editors of the *Critici Sacri*.' (Todd's *Brian Walton*, i. 60.) It has been said that the work was at first actually dedicated to Cromwell, but this does not appear to be the fact. *Ibid.* 84.

⁴ Cromwell's *Memoirs of the Protector*, Oliver Cromwell, Lond. 1820, p. 622.

⁵ 'It does not admit of reasonable doubt that the strength and prevalence of religion during the period in question was far greater than at any former age.' Price's *Hist. of Prot. Nonconf.* ii. 644. See also Neal, iii. 46.

then unusually conspicuous, were of the class closely connected with worldly prudence, and hence fallacious marks of sterling excellence, unless combined with good qualities of a more private and disinterested character in a proportion above the average. This happy excess is necessarily very rare, and it does not seem to have been attained in any remarkable degree by the religious professors of the Commonwealth. Hence their claims to an excellence really above that of other Christian communities have been successfully resisted, and even derided by opponents. As to their outward religious profession, it undoubtedly differed from that of serious men ordinarily by the use of a peculiar phraseology, and by making a great point of certain habits and abstinences. But in such distinctions is nothing absolutely incompatible either with interested practices, proud and angry feelings, or such a degree of personal indulgence as is not publicly offensive. Hence dissenting representations of public religion and morality, when the church was overthrown, have fairly been considered as formed upon a very uncertain estimate. To the loud and disputable religious claims of that day has, however, been attributed, with great probability, the infamous facility with which men of fashion rushed into the other extreme so shamelessly and completely when the old system was restored.

§ 9. In Ireland the church was pretty completely overthrown so early as the autumn of 1641. Then unexpectedly occurred the horrid Irish massacre, from which it was expected Protestantism never would have recovered in that country, and for which, after a few years, Cromwell exacted ample vengeance.¹ To what extent Protestant blood was shed in this ferocious outbreak, and in the rebellious movements consequent upon it, has been disputed. Some accounts make more than three hundred thousand adherents of a scriptural faith to have been slain in the massacre, and within the two succeeding years of trouble. Romish extenuation would fain bring the whole number of sufferers down to eight thousand: but the computations appearing most worthy of reliance, take those who fell during the first slaughter at forty thousand. To this number must, however, be added the frightful sacrifice of Protestant life which continued during most of the two following years. The whole period between the Irish massacre and the king's violent death was, indeed, marked by feeble endeavours to uphold the established worship, but really Romanism had gained full possession of the land, and Romish prelates acted as if the church were legally their own. As a preliminary to an entire seizure of the establishment, they held two synods, one provincial at Armagh, another national at Kilkenny, which pronounced the series of treacherous and sanguinary atrocities by which the island was

¹ The English government had been rendered uneasy, before the close of 1640, by numerous arrivals in Ireland from the continent, but English difficulties rendered the knowledge of this fact useless. The place at which the rebellion seems chiefly to have

been arranged was an old Franciscan convent in Westmeath. 'Through the rest of the island not one note of fear or of preparation interrupted the awful tranquillity of that summer' of 1641. Phelan, 315.

polluted and disgraced, a just and lawful war. When the Long Parliament established its powers, papal exertions against episcopal Protestantism were seconded by a prohibition of the Common Prayer, and orders to supersede it by the Directory in all the churches of Dublin.¹ The country, probably, was inaccessible to Protestantism in any form.

§ 10. As the Presbyterians, disgusted by the prevalence of Independency, had concurred with the royalists in restoring Charles II., they were at first sanguine as to the success of their cherished plans for remodelling the church. What was called a *Comprehension*, seemed to them not only a desirable, but also a practicable object. Nor was the king, seemingly, unfavourable to such a plan. His declaration from Breda, promising such liberty to tender consciences as was consistent with the public peace,² was naturally taken as a pledge of a policy essentially tolerant. He meant, however, toleration to be general, and consequently to include Romanists.³ But the Presbyterians only thought of themselves, and Charles's appointment of eight eminent divines, with two or three of less note, from their body, among the royal chaplains, appeared an evidence of his disposition to befriend the party which had served him so importantly. But of the Presbyterian chaplains, only five ever had the honour of preaching before him, and they not more than once:⁴ nor were sufficient indications wanting, as soon as the royal authority seemed pretty firmly established, that the ancient religious establishment, with such modifications, perhaps, as recent and present circumstances dictated, would soon regain its former position in the country. The incumbents, however, of benefices, of which the former possessors had died since ejection, were still allowed to retain them, notwithstanding any defects of their ecclesiastical character; and upon the whole, such an appearance of moderation characterised all the king's earlier proceedings, as readily led low-churchmen into confident expectations of some ultimate settlement that coincided with their own interests. Charles himself, probably, regarded with weariness and contempt the speculative opinions of both parties. It is now well known, that such religious opinions as he possessed were favourable to Rome. But as he could not allow even a hint of such predilections to transpire without hazarding the gaiety and splendour which he valued above all things, his mind naturally inclined towards prelacy. It was the system of ecclesiastical polity identified with that of the church to which he was secretly attached; it was dear to most of his own warmest friends, and, as a national institution, it was all but coeval with the monarchy itself. Presbyterianism, on the other hand, notwithstanding its recent services to the throne, was identified with all the bitterest mortifications and sufferings of his life, was odious to his firmest adherents, and treated with the fiercest intolerance the only form of religious belief that had taken the least hold upon his affections. In such a

¹ Mant, 585.

² See the paragraph in Collier, ii. 870.

³ Neal, iii. 49.

⁴ Collier, ii. 871.

case, it was easy to see, that, without some such reaction in the public mind as appeared far from likely during the first months after the Restoration, Presbyterian hopes would quickly be found fallacious. As it was, however, neither decent nor politic to dash them on the ground without an appearance of treating them with due attention, Charles announced, in the October after his return, a design of placing a review of the Common Prayer under consideration of an equal number of divines of the episcopal and the presbyterian parties. This pledge was redeemed in the following spring, when the commissioners nominated met each other at the bishop of London's apartments in the Savoy. From the place of meeting, this memorable transaction is known as the *Savoy Conference*. When the two parties confronted each other, the bishops fairly enough treated the whole business as intended merely for the satisfaction of their opponents, having no wishes of their own for any alteration. They desired, accordingly, a full statement in writing of everything that the Presbyterian managers recommended, and utterly refused to enter at once upon those oral discussions which the latter pressed upon them. In adopting this course, they are charged by opponents with an artful intention of drawing from the Presbyterians such a catalogue of objections as would exhaust public patience, and make the party seem incapable of any satisfaction, unless its own very wide expectations were consulted at the expense of those entertained by all the world besides. If any such management were contemplated, it certainly was very much forwarded by Presbyterian indiscretion. Not only were numerous exceptions to the liturgy presented, but also Baxter, perhaps the ablest and most influential man of his party, offered for consideration a new liturgy drawn up by himself within the compass of a single fortnight just before. His brethren had examined and approved it; but such a hasty composition could obviously maintain no sort of competition with the concentrated liturgical labours of ages which the Common Prayer comprises, and its appearance before the episcopal commissioners was, therefore, an undeniable indiscretion in the Presbyterian party.¹ Baxter's own reason for preparing it rather makes the case worse. He wished to leave, he says, a standing memorial, that neither he nor his brethren objected to a stated form of prayer.² Thus he substantiated the common objection to his own party, and to similar opponents of existing institutions, that they have no real objection to the objects of their opposition, but only to see them vested in any other hands than their own. Besides preparing this liturgy, Baxter also drew up what he called a *Petition for Peace*, which is, in fact, a document of considerable power, urging the impossibility of Presbyterian conformity, and the evils that must result both to clergy and laity if it should be pressed. He evidently threatens, rather than entreats; and upon the whole, the services of this, their ablest champion, were disadvantageous to the Presbyterian party, by making it

¹ 'This gave great offence.' Neal, iii. 87.

² Short's *Sketch of the Hist. Ch. Engl.* Lond. 1838, p. 491.

appear unlikely to rest satisfied with anything short of that exclusive ascendancy for which it had contended ever since the beginning of Elizabeth's reign. The episcopal party, however, notwithstanding the unpromising nature of the opposition with which it had to grapple, answered the numerous objections presented with great care and minuteness.¹ But no real progress was made in considering the need of any alterations in the liturgy, until a long paper controversy had nearly exhausted the time allowed in the commission. Then, to render the proceedings productive of some definite end, a disputation took place as to the liturgical expectations of the Presbyterian party. This, however, speedily bore an interminable aspect, from the branching off of objections into the two heads of inexpediency and sinfulness. To cut it short, Bp. Cosin produced a paper which called upon the Presbyterians to state in writing the matters considered sinful. This was answered by a charge, that the Common Prayer Book was flatly sinful, and contrary to the Word of God, in requiring ministers to use the sign of the cross in baptism, to wear surplices, to pronounce all the baptized regenerate, to admit unfit persons to the Eucharist, to insist upon kneeling when it was received, to absolve the unfit, to speak of all persons buried as those whom God has taken to himself, and to subscribe all the public formularies of the church as free from anything contrary to the Word of God. A debate ensued upon kneeling at the Sacrament, which produced a great deal of noise, heat, and subtle syllogistic argumentation, giving the town an opportunity of ridiculing the two principal disputants, but leaving both parties just as irreconcilable as ever. The Episcopalians being by far the more numerous when the dispute concluded, the sinfulness of kneeling was denied by a great majority. The Presbyterians having thus utterly failed of impressing their views of sinfulness upon the other party, and there being evidently no greater chance of effecting this in any of the remaining cases, they proceeded to urge the general good behaviour of their body, the services that it had rendered in the Restoration, and the danger of disregarding it from a mere regard to the spiritual wants of the nation. The bishops, however, denied any power to entertain such questions, professing themselves authorised only to make those alterations in the liturgy which were necessary, and adding, that, in strict accuracy, they knew of none that could be made bearing that character.² In this manner the conference broke up, the time allowed by the commission having expired, and both parties having left it with an increase of mutual dissatisfaction. Still the government was anxious to show a desire to consider the dissenting body; and, accordingly, a royal message came down to Convocation in the following November, enjoining a review of the Book of Common Prayer. After a month's attention, this review was completed, and signed unanimously in both houses. It made various additions and alterations in the liturgy, leaving it as it has been used

¹ The answers may be seen in Collier, ii. 897.

² Neal, iii. 91.

ever since, with the exception of some small particulars, made in parliament, while the act of uniformity was under consideration in the following year, and referred by both houses to a committee of three bishops. In the service-book thus finally arranged, the non-conformists were considered, in taking the sentences, the epistles and gospels, and other extracts from the last version of Scripture, in several alterations of the Communion-service, in the addition of a general thanksgiving, and in various verbal alterations.¹

§ 11. In Ireland, Presbyterian divines were established both in Ulster, which contained numerous families from Scotland, and in Dublin with its neighbourhood. Immediately on the Restoration, these clergymen made exertions for a continuance in their benefices, and entertained hopes of success. But the government quickly undeceived them. Eight of the prelacy survived, and of these, Bramhall, bishop of Derry, the most able man of the party, was nominated to Armagh in the August immediately following Charles's return; to the general satisfaction of all who valued the ecclesiastical system which late troubles had overthrown. His formal appointment was deferred until the following January. Before the end of that month, twelve prelates were consecrated by him at the same time. The see of Kildare continued unsupplied, its revenues having been alienated a century before. But a prebend in St. Patrick's cathedral was annexed to it almost immediately afterwards, and by the consecration of a prelate to it in March of the same year, 1661, the episcopate of Ireland received a complement of four archbishops and seventeen bishops. Eventually the latter were eighteen, and thus they continued until the act of 1833 came into operation. In restoring the church to her temporalities, Charles II. placed the bishops in full possession of all those estates which they or their predecessors had enjoyed in the year 1641, the time when the Irish massacre laid their order in the dust, and exposed its endowments to pillage from various quarters. It may be hastily supposed, that such a mass of property once more vested in the church ought to have produced a general re-enlightenment of the people, and thus have drawn them extensively away from a religion like Romanism, which pretends to no sufficient scriptural authority, and labours under the disadvantage of enjoining or encouraging many things that appear forbidden in Scripture to every reader of it who has neither a bias in his mind, nor a gloss in his hand. But when Ireland regained the religious advantages wrested from her in 1641, she was by no means in a condition to profit adequately by them. The Romish priesthood retained its hold upon the country, and the national establishment had to struggle with such difficulties as paralysed its efforts. Its churches were generally in ruins; the revenues to support the clergy had been, by various means, so enormously alienated, that two or more contiguous benefices, sometimes even eight or nine, were put together,

¹ Short's *Sketch*, 547. The old version is retained in the Psalms and Decalogue. See Cardwell's *Hist. of Conferences*, Oxf. 1840, p. 298.

for the sake of supplying the incumbent with a respectable maintenance; Romish hostility hemmed it everywhere, and in Ulster, Presbyterian hostility was little less formidable, especially after the act of uniformity passed, which in Ireland was not until 1665. In the face of all these discouragements, however, some progress was made in reconciling the nation to the church of England, and the Irish were upon the point of receiving the benefit of religious instruction extensively through the press, in their own language, when Charles II. died; and the succession of a violent Romanist revived all the hopes, however sanguine, of the papal party.¹ It is true that these hopes were dashed, within a very short interval, to the ground, but this disappointment was embittered by new confiscations, which again linked Protestant opinions with a galling sense of pecuniary pillage.

§ 12. Early in the reign of Charles II. the English clergy receded from the practice of taxing themselves. Their constitutional right to do this had been regularly exercised in convocation, from time immemorial, until the late days of the commonwealth. They had then been included in money bills, like all other inhabitants of the country. On the Restoration, the ancient practice was revived, but it gave no pleasure to the clerical body. While taxed in common with their neighbours, clergymen underwent no higher burdens: when taxed apart, they found the court expect more of them than of

¹ Mant, 671. Before the settlement of religion in Ireland is dismissed, it may be useful to mention a judicious expedient by which Abp. Bramhall evaded the inconvenience of insisting upon reordination, which was found in both islands a most formidable obstacle to the conformity of Presbyterian incumbents. 'When the benefices were called at the visitation, several appeared, and exhibited only such titles as they had received from the late powers. He told them they were no legal titles; but in regard he heard well of them, he was willing to make such to them by institution and induction; which they humbly acknowledged, and intreated his lordship to do. But desiring to see their letters of orders, some had no other but their certificates of ordination by some Presbyterian classes, which, he told them, did not qualify them for any preferment in the church. Whereupon the question immediately arose, *Are we not ministers of the Gospel?* To which his grace answered, that *that* was not the question: at least, he desired, for peace' sake, of which he hoped they were ministers too, that *that* might not be the question for that time. *I dispute not*, said he, *the value of your ordination; nor those acts you have exercised by virtue of it: what you are, or might do, here when there was no law, or in other churches abroad. But we are now to consider ourselves as a national church, limited by law, which, among other things, takes chief care to prescribe about*

ordination: and I do not know how you could recover the means of the church, if any should refuse to pay you your tythes, if you are not ordained as the law of this church requireth. And I am desirous that she may have your labours, and you such portions of her revenue as shall be allotted you in a legal way. By this means he gained such as were learned and sober, and for the rest it was not much matter.

'Just as I was about to close up this particular, I received full assurance of all that I offered in it, which, for the reader's sake, I thought fit to add, being the very words which his grace caused to be inserted into the letters of one Mr. Edward Parkinson, whom he ordained at that time, and from whom I had them by my reverend brother and neighbour, the Lord Bishop of Killaloe. *Non annihilantes priores ordines (si quos habuit), nec validitatem aut invaliditatem eorum determinantes, multo minus omnes ordines sacros ecclesiarum forensicarum condemnantes, quos proprio iudici relinquimus: sed solummodo supplentes, quicquid prius defuit per canones Ecclesie Anglicane requisitum; et providentes paci Ecclesie, ut schismatis tollatur occasio, et conscientis fidelium satisfiat, nec ullo modo dubitent de ejus ordinatione, aut actus suos Presbyterales tanquam invalidos aversentur; in cujus rei testimonium, &c.*' Bp. Vesey's *Life of Primate Bramhall*, cited by Bishop Mant, 624.

other men, and that influential persons of their own order were quite willing to force or cajole them into the fulfilment of such expectations. As usual with mankind under any disagreeable pressure, the clergy attributed this court-subserviency of their leaders to interested motives, feeling sure that their money would not be so freely bestowed, if the parties thus ready with it had not reason to reckon upon more than an equivalent in their own particular cases, by means of royal patronage. The prevalence of these feelings led Archbishop Sheldon and the Lord Chancellor Clarendon, in 1664, to propose that separate taxation of the clergy should henceforward cease. In order to render this abandonment of an ancient right more palatable to the body chiefly affected by it, two out of four subsidies, previously granted, were remitted. It had, however, been the practice ever since the Reformation, to confirm the grant of clerical subsidies by act of parliament, and as the four last granted were so confirmed, it became necessary to obtain parliamentary authority for remitting two of them. The act for doing this contains a saving clause, in which the constitutional rights of the clergy are expressly reserved.¹ Their power of taxing themselves is therefore dormant, not abolished. So long, however, as they are placed upon a footing of perfect equality with other men, they have no reason even to wish it revived; and its revival must necessarily be attended with a loss of the privilege of voting for members of parliament, which clergymen had never exercised before they gave up the practice of taxing themselves.²

§ 13. The reign of Charles II. is remarkable for three penal enactments against separation from the national church, which were long conspicuous in English politics, and of which the last remained in active operation until the year 1829. These are the Corporation and Test Acts, and the Act by which Romanists were disabled from sitting in either house of parliament. The *Corporation Act* was passed in 1661, as it is averred by dissenting authorities, in consequence of rumours of revolutionary movements among the non-conforming Pro-

¹ 'Provided always, that nothing herein contained shall be drawn into example to the prejudice of the ancient rights belonging unto the lords spiritual and temporal or clergy of this realm, or unto either of the universities, or unto any colleges, schools, alms-houses, hospitals, or cinque ports.' Kennet's *Complete Hist. Engl.* iii. 255.

² 'Whether this great change in the manner of taxing, now introduced, and likely to continue, be more to the interest or to the prejudice of the church and clergy of England, is not so easy to determine: though, excepting the former independence of the state of the clergy, and the danger of being oppressed when they shall hereafter fall under the displeasure of a House of Commons, we must confess that they have hitherto been better dealt with than while they taxed themselves, and they seem only

to have lost the benefit of presenting their articles of grievances, and obtaining the more easy redress of them as a reward of their liberality to the crown. Nay, the clergy have gained one privilege, that of all rectors and vicars voting for members of parliament, which they never did till their money was now given by the lay commons; and therefore they ought to be now represented by them, and ought, for the same reason, to lose their votes in all parliamentary elections, if ever they could reassume the practice of taxing themselves. There is a clause that does sufficiently reserve that right: but supposing the clergy should think fit to claim it, it is a great question whether the House of Commons will allow it: who, being now in possession of the custom of taxing the clergy, may not be willing to relinquish that custom.' *Ibid.*

testants, which were either grossly exaggerated, or altogether invented by the church party, for the purpose of oppressing its capital enemy.¹ The real origin of this act appears to have been the obvious policy of following a precedent supplied by the late republican times. It had then been the practice to expel from corporations all magistrates who were suspected of disaffection to the ruling powers, and refused to subscribe the covenant.² The new government, while dubious of stability, naturally thought functionaries who owed office to this purgative process, highly dangerous to itself, and not unreasonably sought protection against them by tests of its own. It accordingly provided by the *Corporation Act*, that the king might appoint commissioners to regulate corporations, and expel members of them either improperly admitted, or holding obnoxious principles. All such as remained, or should hereafter be elected, were to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, to make a declaration against taking arms against the king on any pretence whatever, and to renounce the covenant as an unlawful oath. Hereafter none were to be eligible to corporate offices who should not have received the sacrament in the established church within the year previous to election. In virtue of this Act, commissioners were immediately appointed, who, within two years, effectually turned the tables upon the church's enemies, weeding all of them out of corporations with as much industry as they themselves had employed in the same way against the other party a few years before.³ The *Test Act*, as it is commonly called, was passed in 1673, and Protestant dissenters fell under its lash, although they concurred in its enactment, and it was introduced merely as a security against Romanism. It was entitled, *An Act to prevent dangers which happen from Popish Recusants*. The Duke of York and the Romish influence about the throne were the objects to which it really referred, and Protestant non-conformists were so much disquieted by the dangers threatening a scriptural faith from this cause, that they generously submitted to exclusion themselves (if very stiff in their opinions), for the sake of excluding those who were anxious to nullify the Reformation altogether.⁴ The Act required all officers, both civil and military, to take the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and besides to make a declaration against transubstantiation, in an open court of justice: being additionally bound to receive the sacrament at church within six months after admission. In these provisions undoubtedly there was nothing to which an orthodox Protestant dissenter needed to feel an insurmountable objection. Nor, in fact, was it unusual with those who were acknowledged and attached members of dissenting congregations to *qualify*, as taking the sacrament for an official purpose was popularly called, when first placed in office. Perhaps even a Romanist, well informed and liberal, might have taken every part of this test for an especial purpose, without violating his conscience,

¹ Neal, iii. 83.² Hume, xi. 206.³ Neal, iii. 84.⁴ Alderman Love, a Dissenter, and mem-ber for the city, said, 'We are willing to lie under the severity of the laws for a time, rather than clog a more necessary work with our concerns.' *Ibid.* 189.

except the disavowal of transubstantiation. Upon that doctrine, however, his religious position turns, and to disclaim it is conversion, or apostasy, as men would say, according to their different views. In 1678 a test was provided still more severe, and of a wider operation. It was an act for *disabling Papists from sitting in either House of Parliament*. This is the Act which occasioned such long political contests in the earlier years of the nineteenth century, and of which the repeal was popularly called *Catholic emancipation*. It allowed none to vote, or give a proxy, or sit in parliament, without taking the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, renouncing transubstantiation ‘in the presence of God,’ and declaring ‘the invocation of the Virgin and other saints, and the sacrifice of the mass, to be superstitious and idolatrous.’¹ This act had no creditable origin, being passed during the national fever of the popish plot. But however infamous might have been the man who pretended to supply evidence of this conspiracy, and however senseless the nation in believing him, it should in justice be remembered that a popish plot really had some existence, the king himself being implicated in it, both because his religious predilections were all of a Romish cast, and he was mean enough to be corrupted by French gold. Nor, probably, would Oates have found any opening for his fictions had not something of the reality transpired.

§ 14. It has been debated whether James II. meant chiefly the establishment of Popery or that of arbitrary power. There can, however, be no question that he entertained both views during his brief and infatuated reign; and it seems probable, that if he had been assured of attaining the one on condition of abandoning the other, with a power of choosing which was to prevail, his choice would have fallen upon religion. Had mere politics been his principal aim, he would hardly have given himself up so completely as he did to the counsels of headstrong priests, in defiance of the coolness manifested by many lay Romanists,² and even by the court of Rome itself.³ But it is plain that he ascended the throne with a fixed determination to patronise exclusively such as favoured, if they did not profess, his own religion, and most likely, besides, with an intention and expectation of bringing about its re-establishment. It is, indeed, true that he spoke at first very favourably of the Church of England.⁴ He reckoned, however, upon it as a political engine, and fancied that some of those doctrines of passive obedience which had of late been discreditably advocated among the clergy, might be found interwoven in its very constitution.⁵ He also, very probably, reckoned upon those

¹ Butler's *Hist. Mem.* ii. 46.

² ‘Many’ (Romanists) ‘aware that the spirit of discontent was stirring, deprecated any alteration which might afterwards provoke a reaction.’ Lingard, xiii. 58.

³ ‘It was previously’ (to a nuncio's arrival) ‘known to James and his more zealous advisers, that the pontiff disapproved of their ardour and precipitancy.’ *Ibid.* 73.

⁴ James said, in his speech to the privy

council, on his accession, ‘I know the principles of the Church of England are for monarchy, and the members of it have shown themselves good and loyal subjects: therefore, I shall always take care to defend and support it.’ Kennet, iii. 427.

⁵ The king said in his interview with the bishops, which led to their committal: ‘The dispensing power was never questioned by men of the Church of England.’ D'Oyly's *Sanicroft*, 161.

liberal views of Romanism, and approximation to some of its principles and usages, which had prevailed ever since the days of Laud, as evidences that a regular reconciliation with Rome might be rendered sufficiently palatable to the high-church party. But the church, although, on principle, favourable to established authority, can never be reckoned upon by it, when arrayed against herself. Resistance then becomes as much a matter of principle as obedience would be under opposite circumstances. Nor are persons of the Anglican communion, because free from that extreme abhorrence of Popery which many Protestants have professed, and because favourable to certain principles and usages which Romanists derive from high antiquity, at all disposed for a surrender on those vital points which the Reformation denounced, and which Romish theologians never have succeeded in identifying satisfactorily with catholic antiquity. These insurmountable obstacles to their success were, however, neither observed by James, nor by those priestly advisers who possessed his ear. The latter, accordingly, and indeed Romanists generally, courted observation, and assumed an obtrusive tone of confidence, almost immediately after the king's accession.¹ This indiscreet contempt of public opinion not only occasioned general disgust and alarm, but also drove the clergy into such polemic preparations as hunted Popery out of every subterfuge, by the time that James had ended his senseless attempts to force it upon the country.² It was the fear of this argumentative and scholarly storm that impelled him into his first aggressive attempt upon the church in an order against controversial sermons.³ For this he had a precedent of his brother's. A similar order had been issued soon after the Restoration: but its object then was to restrain Episcopalians and Presbyterians from mutually inflaming the public mind. Now, the object sought was to prepare the way for an enemy that threatened every shade of Protestant belief with extermination. Such an object the church courageously resisted, and in spite of royal displeasure, clerical attacks upon Popery became every day more strenuous and able. To repress this activity, John Sharp, dean of Norwich, and rector of St. Giles's-in-the-Fields, eventually archbishop of York, was singled out for an example. He had preached, in May, 1686, upon the true nature of the Catholic church, and reflected upon those who left the church of England for that of Rome. This was the king's own case, although no notice was taken of it particularly, the whole question being treated abstractedly, and probably it did not enter into the preacher's mind while preparing his sermon.⁴ He was, however, highly popular in the pulpit, and every way an influential divine; and his diocesan, Henry Compton, bishop of London,

¹ Neal, iii. 265.

² 'The discourses and other writings which were then composed, form collectively, perhaps, the most powerful bulwark against those adversaries which has ever been produced. They have been collected under the title of a *Preservative against Popery*, in three folio volumes, and form a

highly valuable repository of theological learning, most creditable to the erudition, the zeal, and the industry of the members of our national church.' D'Oyly's *Sancreoft*, 132.

³ Dated March 5, 1686. Kennet, iii. 454.

⁴ Newcome's *Life of Abp. Sharp*, Lond. 1825, i. 70.

received a royal order to suspend him. The prelate respectfully declined, alleging that he was called upon to do a judicial act without any necessary preliminary of judicial forms; but he recommended Sharp to abstain from preaching until the king should be willing to let him resume it, and this recommendation was unhesitatingly taken. While, however, the business was in progress, James had been so rash and ill-advised as to set up an *Ecclesiastical Commission*,¹ which was justly deemed little or nothing else than a revival of the High Commission Court, abolished, with every similar judicature, by statute, in the 17th of Charles I.² This tribunal suspended Bishop Compton, and thus placed before the country one of the principal churchmen, who was a man of family, and had lately shown very just views of his public duties, as a victim of arbitrary power, and a martyr to the Protestant religion. While people were brooding indignantly over his wrongs, their excitement was increased by conduct in other quarters of an opposite description, and by the king's injudicious patronage of it. At every time men will be found ready with such alleged convictions as make for their interests: it is greatly to the credit of the Church of England that no great number of such men has ever been found within her pale when her principles, position, and efficiency were at stake. Of course the reign of James II. supplied some such. An open conversion to Popery, or that advocacy of its pretensions which may colourably pass for liberal and enlightened, were modes of remedying defects of professional eminence, or influential patronage, so very easy and obvious, that the reign of James II. was certain to bring forward clergymen thus recommended. The master of University college, Oxford, and a few other ecclesiastics of less note, accordingly, soon came before the public, as enlightened by the same religious convictions that awakened such lively interest in the royal patron. In their favour, James dispensed with the tests, that must otherwise have deprived them of preferment. His power to confer this indulgence was declared an integral part of the kingly prerogative by nearly all the judges; and a general acquiescence of the nation in their decision seemed at one time likely to be ultimately gained. James was thus decoyed into further violations of statute law and the rights of individuals, covering every such act of infatuation with the illimitable mantle of his dispensing power. In this way both universities were arrayed against him; and after the unsuccessful trial of the seven bishops, nearly all England loathed his administration, as incurably hostile both to sound religion and constitutional rights. It is true, that he had, at one time, obtained considerable popularity among the Dissenters by suspending the penal laws in their favour, including

¹ Kennet states, that although this new court did not open until August, yet the commission for erecting it was issued in April. The biographer of Abp. Sharp, however, asserts that Bp. Compton objected to its cognisance of his case, as being a judicature established after the matter charged occurred, and that the chancellor did not

deny the correctness of the dates, but merely claimed a retrospective operation for the court. Newcome's *Sharp*, i. 68.

² It was pleaded, that another act, 13 Car. 2, had authorised the present court, though not with those extraordinary powers that had been exercised by the old high commission. Kennet, iii. 456.

the Test Act. They were thus left at liberty to worship God publicly in their own way, and acquired that influence in corporations which their body, lying as it does very much among certain classes of traders, is sure to possess when its energies are left unfettered. But then their liberty was shared by the Romanists, whom they abhorred, and felt no disposition to tolerate, and who, they felt certain, would drive them again into the fires of Smithfield, if ever Popery should regain its old ascendancy. To bring this about, however, they considered as James's only aim, not any liberal views of leaving all men to follow freely a religion of their own. Hence the Dissenters had no sooner their former power in corporations, or something near it, than they used it against the crown; willingly listening to schemes of toleration or comprehension by which the church party proposed to unite the whole Protestant body, if it could be freed from existing dangers.¹ While James thus held sovereignty by a mere thread, the birth of a male heir accomplished his ruin. As his own age was considerably advanced, and both his daughters were staunch Protestants, the common course of nature might soon relieve the nation from any further apprehensions for its religion. But an infant, certain to be educated in all the violence of Romish prejudice, with a Romish mother too, who might long be regent, offered a prospect which zealous Protestantism would not face. Before the birth of this unfortunate child, rumours had been eagerly circulated, and seemingly were generally credited, that a supposititious male heir was to crown the king's delinquencies, and insure, if the nation would allow it, a firm establishment for tyranny and popery.² When James really reached the ruin which his folly had so industriously prepared, and was pressing forward with the most humiliating retractations, he offered sufficient evidence of the young prince's lawful birth. But nothing was less desired by the nation than conviction of that kind: hence the spuriousness of the Pretender's origin was long a standing article of popular belief in England. His legitimacy was embarrassing to national prepossessions in favour of hereditary right, and unquestionably his admission to the throne would have jeopardied both the religion and the liberties of Englishmen. His appearance, accordingly, on the theatre of life, instantly sealed the fate of that infatuated government which sanguine Romanism thought only waiting for such an event to become permanently consolidated.

§ 15. Soon after the revolution, it was unanimously voted in the convention parliament,³ that popery on the throne has been proved

¹ 'Sir John Shorter, the new lord-mayor, and a Protestant dissenter, thought fit to qualify himself for this office according to law, though the test was suspended, and the king had signified to the mayor that he was at liberty, and might use what form of worship he thought best in Guildhall.' Neal, iii. 290.

'While the bishops were in the Tower and the Princess Anne at Bath, the queen

was declared to be delivered of a prince, on Sunday, June 10, between the hours of nine and ten in the morning. This mysterious birth was conducted with great artifice or great imprudence; no care had been taken to satisfy the Protestant part of the nation that the queen was with child, though it was ridiculed in pamphlets dispersed about Whitehall.' *Ibid.* 305.

³ Jan. 29, 1689.

by experience inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this Protestant nation. Papists were, therefore, virtually declared incapable of the English sceptre. But inherent exclusion from royal power having thus been proclaimed against the religious principles which drove James from his country, the claims of those which were so largely concerned in raising William to the sovereignty could not in equity or with safety be overlooked. Nor, indeed, was the indisposition to favour the scruples of non-conformity nearly so great as it had been during the violence of that reaction which naturally exasperated high-church prejudices in most of Charles II.'s reign. On the contrary, schemes of toleration and of comprehension were in agitation among the heads of the church and their friends, before James had been driven from the land which loathed his austere temper, dull understanding, Romish bigotry, and loose indulgences.¹ The church, indeed, had obviously fallen into urgent need of assistance from every Protestant quarter, and the Dissenters had shown themselves magnanimous enough to make common cause with their ancient rival and oppressor, rather than fall into the snares of that party which was hostile to a scriptural faith altogether. Hence the king recommended some such qualification for office as would lay it open to all Protestants able and willing to take it. A bill was accordingly brought into the House of Lords for abrogating the former oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and substituting other oaths in their place. This occasioned a committee for drawing up reasons explanatory of the proposed abrogation, and for preparing a clause to abolish the sacramental test on admission to office. The design, however, miscarried by a very great majority. Nor was another motion more successful, which condemned any other than religious motives in receiving the sacrament, and admitted the reception of it in dissenting congregations, within twelve months before or after, as a sufficient security on the taking of office.² Thus the Test Act was continued in force. But notwithstanding, the revolution ended the substantial hardships of orthodox Protestant Dissenters. The *Toleration Act* was passed with little difficulty,³ though, as might be reasonably expected, not entirely to the satisfaction of all the church party. By it, separate congregations and absence from church were exempted from the penalties of existing statutes, on condition that parties claiming such indulgence should take the oath of allegiance, and subscribe the declaration against popery. Dissenting ministers also were to subscribe the doctrinal articles of the church of England, but Quakers were freed from this condition. Neither Papists, nor anti-Trinitarians, were to be included within this measure of toleration. In practice, this Act secured, within a few years, more than its letter strictly warranted, subscription to doctrinal articles gradually becoming obsolete, and the Protestant dissenter being thus really left in the unfettered exercise of his own discretion.

¹ Abp. Sancroft himself was engaged upon deliberations of this kind. D'Oyly's *Sancroft*, 197.

² Kennet, iii. 518.

³ It received the royal assent May 24, 1689. *Ibid.* 550.

§ 16. The scheme of a comprehension, or a religious arrangement satisfactory to Dissenters, proved a total failure. The subject was introduced into the upper House, while the bill for toleration was under discussion, and some of the peers earnestly contended for the appointment of a committee, such as had been contemplated under Henry VIII. and Edward VI., in which laymen should be blended with ecclesiastics, for the preparation of some well-digested plan for altering the liturgy and canons, and improving ecclesiastical courts. This was, however, opposed by Burnet, newly made bishop of Salisbury, under a conviction that it would increase the dissatisfaction, already rising among the clergy and their warmest friends.¹ Tillotson also, then clerk of the closet, and much consulted by the king, objected to the plan, as likely to confirm the Romish jeers of worshipping God by act of parliament. He recommended that nothing should be done by the legislature in this delicate matter, which had not been previously approved by convocation, and that a committee of divines should be appointed by royal authority to consider what alterations this latter might advantageously discuss.² The Commons proved as unwilling to enter upon the plan of comprehension as any high-churchman could desire, ending a debate upon the bill for it sent down from the upper House, by an address to the crown to summon a convocation and advise with it on ecclesiastical affairs. When this body met, it displayed immediately a spirit highly unfavourable to the proposed comprehension. Tillotson was meant by the crown for prolocutor of the lower House: but it chose Dr. Jane, regius professor of divinity at Oxford, who had rendered himself conspicuous in the ill-judged proceedings there of 1683, which committed the university to the doctrine of passive obedience, and who now closed his opening speech with the unbending language of England's ancient baronage, *Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari*.³ This sentence became the watch-word of his party,⁴ and it was the party that prevailed. Thirty divines, of whom ten were prelates, were appointed, by royal authority, according to Tillotson's plan, for the preparation of matters to be considered in convocation.⁵ They decided upon numerous proposals for alterations,⁶ of which some were, perhaps, desirable, but the number was great beyond necessity, and it became evident that a majority of the assembled clergy would receive none of them. Hence the revised liturgy was never publicly brought forward.⁷ This determination of the clergy, to abide pertinaciously by existing formularies, might have arisen partly from a factious spirit of opposition to

¹ Neal, iii. 319.

² Nichols, *Defensio Eccl. Angl.* Lond. 1707, p. 95.

³ Kennet, iii. 552.

⁴ Nichols, 99.

⁵ Sept. 13, 1689. D'Oyly's *Sancroft*, 199.

⁶ An account of these may be seen in Nichols (95), Bp. Short's *Sketch of the Hist. Ch. Engl.* (586), and Neal's *Hist. Pur.*

iii. 322. Some of the proposed alterations are verbal, and not material: but a discretion was to be left as to the surplice, baptismal sponsors, and kneeling at the sacrament, which could hardly have failed of leading to embarrassment and irregularity. [They were printed, by order of the House of Commons, in 1854. *Ed.*]

⁷ Kennet, iii. 552.

the court, and an illiberal hatred of Dissenters. But it is unlikely that such low motives were alone in operation. Even with the knowledge of the past that men then possessed, there must have reasonably seemed to many, no great probability of devising any plan which would satisfy all scruples. The increased experience of another century has shown that any such expectation must have proved utterly futile. Numerous, besides, as were the proposed alterations, more were pretty certain to be started in the course of debate, if the assembly had not been so stiffly opposed to innovation altogether, and thus a liturgy and a body of canons might have come before the country, differing materially from those which had been heretofore in use. By this means, however, a great advantage would have been given to the non-juring schism. It might have represented itself as the real church of England, while the body which legally bore that name, and took the profits of benefices, was little or nothing else than a factious company of selfish men, who were ready to surrender anything if they could only secure wealth for themselves, and place under a ban of proscription the great mass of competitors for preferment. It is, accordingly, far from certain that the hand of improvement was then arrested as absolutely needless and injurious. On the contrary, it seems that many merely thought the time unsuitable for innovation,¹ and the actual state of parties entitles their view to respectful consideration.

§ 17. Among the reasons which induced the convocation to doubt the seasonableness of alterations in the church, was the state of episcopacy in Scotland.² When William's declaration of October 10 became known in that country, all the bishops but two prepared an address to James, and commissioned two of their body to present it to him in London. This document, which is dated November 3, has been loudly censured as a perfect model of profane flattery and hypocritical time-serving.³ It is not, however, in fact, very different from the pieces usually presented to princes in that age, not even from one that the Presbyterian synod of Fife addressed to Charles II.⁴ When this particular address reached London, the unfortunate sovereign whom it was meant to support and console had taken flight; and as communications were not very rapid in those days, the pre-

¹ 'Some that were named in the commission did either not appear, or did soon desert their other brethren, upon a high notion, either that no alterations ought to be made, or at least that this was not a seasonable time for making them: of which number were Dr. Jane, regius professor of divinity at Oxford, and some others.' Kennet, 551.

² 'Sed plurimis in synodo agentibus, suspicio nullo modo evellenda insederat, quod Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ hoc commentio insidiæ pararentur, Quod res episcopalis, in Scotia modo eversa, jam in Angliâ impeteretur. Vereri, ne a Regis legatis multi in societatem nefariam perducti fuerint, aut saltem callidorum hominum fallaciis illusi,' Nichols, 98.

³ 'This letter breathes forth the true spirit of our Scots prelates since the Reformation, save only they want occasion to discover their persecuting spirit, and here run into the other evil of vile flattery and adulation, and in some things border upon blasphemy.' Woodrow's *Hist. of the Sufferings of the Ch. of Scotl.* Edinb. 1722, ii. 646.

⁴ 'Who, if in anything to be enjoined we cannot give active obedience, we hope will be pacified by our passive obedience, which we resolve to yield as our God calleth us, rather than to sin against him.' Russell's *Hist. of the Ch. in Scotl.* ii. 332.

lates intrusted with it were very much at a loss to know what was best to be done. William still felt himself in a highly uncertain position, and would have been very glad to conciliate the episcopal party in Scotland. He had, besides, found it much more important than representations made to him on the continent by its opponents led him to expect. He came over with a notion that the country was all but wholly Presbyterian. He now discovered that this was untrue, except as to the trading and inferior classes; the gentry, with their connexions and dependents, being chiefly episcopalians.¹ Hence he was anxious to make a friend of the church, and would probably have saved it, had not adverse incidents driven him another way. Rose, bishop of Edinburgh, however, one of the prelates deputed to wait upon James, had an interview with him, which must have been felt as highly unsatisfactory. He had, indeed, already spoken with indiscreet warmth in favour of the fallen monarch to Bishop Compton, and this language most probably found its way to court. William was naturally mortified and offended, although Rose had no commission from his brethren or those of his communion to the successful invader, and therefore could only speak his private sentiments. In Scotland, however, the episcopalian party was almost immediately after confirmed in disaffection to the new government, by finding itself in certain districts left defenceless at the mercy of fanatical mobs. No sooner did intelligence of James's ruin reach the western counties, which had been the principal seat of Cameronian excesses, than the wild populace rose upon the unfortunate clergy, and drove them from their cures and homes, with every circumstance of indignity and spoliation.² It is hardly doubtful that the new unsettled government had not sufficient means to repress this execrable spirit of outrage. But men under the extremity of suffering do not stop to make such allowances. They only feel the smart of their own miseries, and complain of remissness or hostility in that government which was instituted and is paid to protect them from such hardships. The government in this case, too, had one for its head who was educated a Presbyterian, and who felt soreness and embarrassment from the very party which was now hunted down by lawless Presbyterian mobs. Thus the episcopalians became daily more alienated from the new administration, and this, in turn, as it gained strength, grew unfavourable to episcopacy. Hence the convention parliament, which assembled after the English precedent, not only declared in its *Claim of Right*, on the 11th of April, 1689, that no papist could lawfully be sovereign, but also that 'prelacy was a great and insupportable grievance and trouble, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people.' The natural tendency of such a vote being the increase of alienation on both sides, and the crown finding its interest more

¹ Bp. Compton's speech to Bp. Rose. Russell's *Hist. of the Ch. in Scotl.* ii. 340.

² 'It has been already stated that about two hundred incumbents, with their families,

were expelled in the course of the winter of 1688, and exposed to all the pains and privations which cold, hunger, and a fanatical multitude could inflict.' *Ibid.* 352.

likely to be promoted by taking part against episcopacy, that form of ecclesiastical polity was easily abolished in Scotland, by act of parliament, on the 22nd of the following July. It was impossible that such events should not occasion disgust and alarm among the steadier of the English episcopalians. They could not hear of the miseries which their unfortunate brethren had undergone in the last winter in the western Scottish counties, from the unrestrained violence of fanatical mobs, and of the legislative proscription of their church in the following spring and summer, without a suspicion that their own condition might prove precarious. Whatever faults, therefore, might be committed by individuals met in convocation upon the scheme of comprehension, more allowance is fairly claimable for them than has commonly been made. With an enemy triumphant in North Britain, and clamouring at the gates in South, cautious men might well consider the next autumn as time unseasonable for tempting his boldness by showing a ready disposition to make him new concessions.

§ 18. The reign of William III. is especially worthy of notice in a student of ecclesiastical history, because it placed the British throne on a basis essentially Protestant. The legislature assumed a power of selecting such a line of succession among individuals descended from the ancient royal family as should render a return to Romanism impossible in the sovereign. A clause added to the *Bill of Rights* in the House of Lords provides not only that every person in communion with the church of Rome, or marrying a papist, shall for ever be incapable of the crown, but also that in case of any British sovereign's apostasy to Popery, the people shall be absolved from their allegiance, and the next heir shall immediately succeed, if a Protestant, just as if the royal personage reconciled to the church of Rome, or marrying a papist, had actually died.¹ This act was passed towards the close of 1689. In the earlier part of that year, the crown had been settled upon the reigning sovereigns, William and Mary, and their issue, failing which, upon the Princess Anne and her issue. The king was desirous of a further entail upon the Hanover family, being personally partial to it, and then intent upon gaining over its head to a close participation of his foreign policy. A motion to this effect passed the Lords, but the Commons rejected it, chiefly, as it seems, because, from the Princess Anne's known situation, it was likely to be found unnecessary. She was, in fact, shortly after delivered of a prince, immediately created Duke of Gloucester, and thus all further precautions against a popish successor became for the present superfluous. The royal boy, however, died in July, 1700, and thus a new arrangement became essential to the public tranquillity. Hence was passed in the following year the *Act of Settlement*, which received the royal assent on the 12th of June, 1701.² By this enactment the British crown was settled, in case of the

¹ Kennet, iii. 546.

² Halliday's *Hist. of the House of Guelf*, Lond. 1821, p. 145.

Princess Anne's death without issue, upon Sophia, widow of Ernest Augustus, elector of Hanover,¹ and her issue, being Protestants. This lady was youngest daughter of Frederick V., elector Palatine, and eventually chosen, to his own great detriment, king of Bohemia. Her mother was Elizabeth Stuart, daughter of James I. To say nothing, however, of James II.'s proscribed issue, there was then a grand-daughter of Charles I. alive, namely, Anne, Duchess of Savoy, daughter of Henrietta, Duchess of Orleans. There were also other members of the Palatine family, whose claims by seniority stood before Sophia's. In fact, there were about forty individuals then living descended from James I.² But all of them, except the dowager electress, were Romanists, her nearest connexions of the Palatine family having apostatised from that scriptural religion for which their house had undergone so much.³ If, however, a prospect were opened of succeeding to the English throne, some of these individuals might probably have been found quite willing to talk of undue haste in embracing popery, and to make a profession of Protestantism. But the English parliament wisely refused interested minds any temptation to a conformity which was likely to prove hollow and insidious, by settling the crown upon an individual whose religious position had never afforded any ground for suspicion.⁴ The *Act of Settlement* was therefore a political arrangement of the highest importance to the religious world. It secured from the pestilent operations of a Romish confessional, a throne which was rising in power throughout the eighteenth century, and which has now no equal in Europe, except in France and Russia. Had not allegiance to the British sovereign been made conditional, the temptation of matrimonial connexions with the principal royal houses abroad might have introduced again artful Jesuits, with all the seductive blandishments of paganised Christianity, so germane to the corrupt nature of man, into the families of our sovereigns. But by guarding effectually

¹ William of England induced the emperor to raise him to the electoral dignity in 1692. But the elevation gave offence in some quarters, and on allegation of informality it was not universally admitted. Halliday, 141.

² *Ibid.* 145.

³ 'Though many of her family were rigid members of the Roman catholic church, she' (Sophia) 'was educated a protestant, under the care of her cousin, the Princess of Orange, and she remained firmly attached to the doctrines and principles of that faith.' (*Ibid.* 165.) She was born on the 13th of October, 1630, married in 1658, left a widow in 1698, and died on the 8th of June, 1714. Queen Anne died on the first of the following August. Sophia's son, the elector George Lewis, had now become heir to the British throne, and, under the designation of George I., was its first occupant of the Hanoverian family.

⁴ 'These last' (others of the Palatine family) 'had abjured the reformed faith, of which their ancestors had been the strenuous assertors; but it seemed not improbable that some one might return to it.' (Hallam's *Const. Hist.* iii. 244.) 'While the bill regulating the succession' (that of 1689) 'was in the House of Commons, a *proviso* was offered by Mr. Godolphin, that nothing in this Act is intended to be drawn into example or consequence hereafter, to prejudice the right of any Protestant prince or princess, in their hereditary succession to the imperial crown of these realms. This was much opposed by the whigs; both because it tended to let in the son of James II. if he should become a Protestant, and for a more secret reason, that they did not like to recognise the continuance of any hereditary right. It was rejected by 179 to 125.' *Ibid.* note.

against any such contingency, the *Bill of Rights* and the *Act of Settlement* have opposed a solid bulwark to the range of Romish sophistry and ambition.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF THE ARMINIANS OR REMONSTRANTS.

§ 1. The name of Arminians — § 2. Their origin — § 3. Their progress — § 4. The five points — § 5, 6. Maurice resolves on their destruction — § 7. Opinion of the Synod of Dort — § 8. Condition after the synod of Dort — § 9. Recalled from exile — § 10. Early and later theology of the Arminians — § 11. Its aim, and principal heads — § 12. Their Confession of Faith — § 13. Present state of the Arminians.

§ 1. FROM the bosom of the Reformed church, to its great injury, there originated in the present century two sects, the *Arminians* and the *Quakers*; the former owing its birth to an excessive regard for human reason, and the latter to a neglect of it. The *Arminians* derived their name and their rise from *James Harmensen*, or (as he chose to be called in Latin) *James Arminius*; first a minister of the Gospel at Amsterdam, and then professor of theology at Leyden; a man whom even his enemies commend for his ingenuousness, acuteness, and piety.¹ They are also called *Remonstrants*, from the petition which they presented to the states of Holland and West Friesland, in 1610, which was entitled a *Remonstrance*. And as the friends of Calvinism presented another petition, in opposition to this, under the title of a *Counter-Remonstrance*, they obtained the name of *Contra-Remonstrants*.

§ 2. *Arminius*, though trained from infancy in the Genevan doctrines, and even educated in the academy of Geneva itself, when

¹ The fullest account given of him is by Caspar Brandt, in his *Historia Vitæ Jac. Arminii*, Leyden, 1724, 8vo, and republished, with a preface and some notes, by me; Brunsw. 1725, 8vo. Add the *Nouveau Dictionnaire Hist. et Critique*, i. 471, &c. [and the Creed of Arminius, with a brief sketch of his life and times, by M. Stuart, in the *Biblical Repertory*, Andover, 1831, vol. i. No. ii. p. 226—308. *Tr.*] The entire works of Arminius have been repeatedly published, in a moderate-sized 4to volume. I use the edition of Frankfort, 1634, 4to. Those who wish to discover and estimate correctly the genius of the man, should read especially his *Disputationes*, both the public and the private. His manner of teaching partakes somewhat of the dark scholasticism of his age; and yet it approximates to that simplicity and perspicuity, which his followers have regarded, and still regard, as among the primary excellences of a theolo-

gian. The historians of the sect, and its Confessions, are treated of by Jo. Christ. Köcher, *Biblioth. Theol. Symbol.* p. 481, &c. [See also G. S. Franck's *Diss. Theologica de Historia Dogmatum Arminianorum*, Kiel, 1813, 8vo. *Tr.*—Among their Confessions may be reckoned—I. Their *Remonstrance*, in 1610, which was presented to the States, in vindication of Arminius and other divines accused of error, and was first printed in 1617.—II. Their proper *Confession*, of 1621, which S. Episcopius set forth.—III. Their *Apology*, in 1629, in reply to the confutation of their Confessions by the Leyden divines, set forth by Episcopius.—IV. Their *Catechism*, of 1640, by Jo. Uytenbogaerd.—V. Lastly, their *Acta et Scripta Synodalia Dordracena*, Harderwyck (or rather, printed on board a ship), 1620, 4to. These are very different from the *Acta Synodi Dordr.* published at Dort in folio. *Schl.*]

arrived at manhood, abandoned the common doctrine of the majority in the Reformed church, respecting predestination and the divine decrees, and went over to the side of those who believe that the love of God and the merits of our Saviour concern the whole human race.¹ Time and reflexion having confirmed him in these sentiments, he thought himself required, by duty and candour, to profess them publicly, when called to the office of a professor at Leyden, and to oppose the opinions of *Calvin*, which were embraced by most of the Dutch divines. And this he was the more bold to do, because he knew that many persons besides himself, and some of them men of the highest respectability, were averse from the Genevan opinions on this subject; neither were the teachers required, either by the *Belgic Confession*, or by any other public law, to think and teach just as *Calvin* did. *Arminius* inculcated what he deemed true, not without effect: for he persuaded great numbers to adopt his sentiments. But at the same time he drew on himself immense odium from the Calvinistic school, which then flourished greatly in Holland. In particular, *Francis Gomar*, his colleague, was very hostile to him. Such was the commencement of this long and most intricate controversy. But *Arminius* died, in 1609, just as it began to become serious and spread itself over the whole United Provinces.²

§ 3. After the death of *Arminius*, the controversy was carried on, for several years, without any decisive advantage gained by either party. The wishes of the Arminians, who sought only to have their opinions tolerated in the state or republic, were not a little favoured by the first men in the commonwealth, such as *John van Oldenbarnevelt*, *Hugo Grotius*, *Rembold Hoogerbeets*, and others. For these individuals thought that in their free country, every one might believe what he chose, on subjects not determined by the *Belgic Confession*: and they used every means to bring the Calvinists to bear with moderation the dissent of the opposite party. And even Prince *Maurice* of Orange, the head of the commonwealth, who afterwards became the capital enemy of the Arminians, together with his mother and the court, was at first not averse from these views.

¹ The occasion of this change is treated of by Peter Bertius, *Oratio in Funus Arminii*; by Caspar Brandt, *Vita Arminii*, p. 22, and by nearly all the historians of these events. The change took place in 1591, as appears from the famous letter of Arminius to Gryneus, written in this year (and extant in the *Biblioth. Bremensis Theol. Philologica*, iii. 384), for he there states his doubts.

² No one has more copiously treated the whole history of the controversy, and the public schism that arose from it, than Gerhard Brandt, in his excellent work, *The History of the Reformation in Belgium*, written in Dutch, volumes ii. and iii., of which there are extant concise epitomes, both in English and in French. To this may be added Jo. Uytenbogaerd's *Ecclesiastical*

History [of the United Provinces, 1647, fol.] also written in Dutch; Phil. Limborch's *Historia Vitæ Episcopii*, and the *Epistolæ Clarorum Virorum* (commonly called *Epistolæ Arminianorum*), published by Limborch. Such as wish for a shorter narrative, may consult Phil. Limborch's *Relatio Historica de Origine et Progressu Controversiarum in Fœderato Belgio de Prædestinatione et Capitibus annexis*, which is subjoined to the later editions of his *Theologia Christiana*. But all these were Arminians. Such as think proper to hear also the contrary party, may consult Jac. Trigland's *Ecclesiastical History*, written in Dutch, and some of the numerous writings which have been published against the Remonstrants.

Hence the conference between the parties at the Hague in 1611: hence also the discussion at Delft in 1613: and likewise the edict of the States of Holland in 1614, in favour of peace; and all the other efforts to reconcile brethren, whom religion had separated from each other.¹ But the suspicion of the Calvinists that the Arminians aimed at the overthrow of all religion, was so far from being allayed by these measures that it daily became more confirmed; and they censured without reserve the efforts of the magistrates to maintain the public peace by their authority.² And whoever regards truth more than every other consideration, must acknowledge, that the Arminians were not sufficiently cautious in avoiding intercourse and familiarity with persons who were eager to advance opinions that were a very wide departure from the Reformed religion; and in this way they gave the greatest occasion to their adversaries of suspecting everything bad and pernicious to the public religion.

§ 4. The whole controversy, however, which assumed, after the council at Dort, a very different form, and was enlarged by many additions, was at this time confined to the doctrines of grace and predestination; and was comprehended by the Remonstrants in the five propositions, which are so well known under the name of the *Five Points*. For the Arminians taught—I. That God, before the foundation of the world, or from eternity, decreed to bestow eternal salvation on those who he foresaw would keep their faith in Christ Jesus inviolate until death; and, on the other hand, to consign over to eternal punishments the unbelieving, who resist the invitations of God to the end of their lives.—II. That Jesus Christ, by his death, made expiation for the sins of all and every one of mankind: yet that none but believers can become partakers of this divine benefit.—III. That no one can, of himself, or by the powers of his free will, produce or generate in his own mind faith; but that it is necessary a man, who is by nature evil, and incompetent (*ineptus*) both to think and to do good, should be born again, and renewed by God, for Christ's sake, through the Holy Spirit.—IV. That this divine grace or energy, which heals the soul of man, commences, advances, and perfects all that can be called truly good in man: and therefore all good works are ascribable to no one except to God only, and to his grace: yet that this grace compels no man against his will, though it may be repelled by his perverse will.—V. That those who are united to Christ by faith, are furnished with strength abundantly to

¹ The authors who treat particularly of these events are mentioned by the writers of general history; and we therefore omit to name them. Yet Michael le Vassor, who in the first and second volumes of his *Histoire de Louis XIII.* has particularly treated of these troubles, deserves especially to be read. [But still more, Van Wagenaer, *History of the United Netherlands*, iv. 311, &c. of the German translation. *Schl.*]

² The conduct of the magistrates, who sought to quiet the commotions by their

interposition, and who not only employed persuasion, but likewise commands, was eloquently and learnedly defended by Hugo Grotius, in two treatises. The one, which is in everybody's hands and has been often printed, is a general treatise, entitled *De Jure summarum Potestatum circa Sacra*: the other descends to particulars, and is entitled, *Ordinum Hollandiæ et Westfrisiæ Pietas a multorum Calumniis vindicata*. Lugd. Bat. 1613, 4to.

overcome the snares of the devil and the allurements of sin: but whether they can fall from this state of grace, and lose their faith, or not, does not yet sufficiently appear, and must be ascertained by a careful examination of the Holy Scriptures. The last of these propositions the Arminians afterwards so modified, as to assert explicitly that it is possible a man should lose his faith, and fall from a state of grace.¹ At that time, therefore, if we may judge of men's meaning by their statements and declarations, the Arminians very much resembled the Lutherans. The Calvinists, however, maintain that the opinions of the Arminians are not to be learned from their declarations, but that their language must be interpreted by their secret sentiments: for they assert that the Arminians, under these specious representations, instilled the poison of Socinianism and Pelagianism into honest and unsuspecting minds. God is the judge of men's hearts: yet if it were allowable to estimate the import of these propositions by what the leading men of the sect have taught more recently, it would be very difficult wholly to disprove that judgment of the Calvinists. For, whatever the Arminians may say, the doctrines taught since the synod of Dort by their principal doctors, respecting grace, and the points connected with it, approach much nearer to the sentiments of those called Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians than to those professed by the Lutherans.

§ 5. The Arminians, supported by the friendship of the magistrates, viewed their cause as by no means desperate, when suddenly an unexpected storm laid it entirely prostrate. There arose first concealed ill-will, and afterwards hostility, amongst the principal administrators of the new Belgic republic. On the one hand were *John van Oldenbarneveldt*, a very distinguished man, *Hugo Grotius*, and *Rembold Hoogerbeets*; and on the other, the Stadtholder, *Maurice* prince of Orange. According to some authors, *Maurice* wished to be created Count of Holland; a design which his father *William* had before entertained:² according to others, he only wished to obtain more

¹ The history of these Five Articles, especially among the English, was written by Peter Heylin, and translated from English into Dutch by Gerhard Brandt, and published at Rotterdam, 1687, 8vo. [These articles were exhibited by the Remonstrants in the conference at the Hague, in 1611, or two years after the death of Arminius. *Tr.*]

² That *Maurice* aimed at the dignity of Count of Holland, is stated by Lewis Aubery, from the representations of his father Benjamin Aubery, the French ambassador to Holland, in his *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de Hollande et des autres Provinces Unies*, sect. ii. p. 216, ed. Paris, 1697, 8vo. According to Aubery, Oldenbarneveldt disapproved and resisted this design of the prince; and *Maurice* revenged this temerity by the capital punishment of this great patriot. The truth of this statement is opposed at great length by Mich. le Vassor, in

his *Histoire de Louis XIII.* t. ii. pt. ii. p. 123, &c. But John le Clerc, in his *Biblioth. Choisie*, ii. 134, &c., and in his *Historia Provinciarum Belgii Fœderati*, takes great pains to substantiate the truth of this statement of Aubery, or rather of his father: and he also shows that *Maurice's* father had the same designs. It is not necessary we should decide this dispute. It is sufficient for our purpose, that *Maurice* was viewed, by Oldenbarneveldt and his friends, as wishing to subvert the liberties of his country, and to obtain supreme power (which no one denies); and that this was the cause of Oldenbarneveldt's eagerness to weaken the influence of *Maurice*, and to check the progress of his power; whence arose the indignation of *Maurice*, and the calamities of the Arminians, who adhered to Oldenbarneveldt and Grotius.

authority and power than appeared consistent with the liberties of the state: at least (as no one denies), he was thought by the leading men to be seeking supreme dominion, which would overthrow liberty. The heads of the Batavian republic, whom we have mentioned, and who were also the patrons of the Arminians, resisted these designs. The Remonstrants were strenuous on the side of their friends, because all their hopes of safety centred in them: and on the other hand their adversaries accommodated themselves to the views and wishes of the prince, and inflamed his already irritated mind, by various new suspicions. He therefore, kindling with indignation, resolved on the destruction of those who guided the commonwealth by their counsels, and of the Arminians who were their supporters; and at the same time joined himself to the party of the Calvinists. Those leading men in the republic above mentioned, were therefore thrown into prison. *Oldenbarneveldt*, a man of great respectability, and venerable both for his grey hairs and for his long and faithful public services, was consigned to a capital punishment. *Grotius* and *Hoogerbeets* were condemned to perpetual imprisonment,¹ under I know not what pretence.² The cause of the Arminians could not be brought

¹ That the general course of events was such as is here stated, will not be denied at the present day, when the times of excitement have gone by, even by the patrons of Calvinistic sentiments, who are ingenuous. And they may grant this without injury to their cause. For if their predecessors (though I wish neither to deny nor to affirm the fact), while guarding and defending their religious opinions, either from the customs of the age, or from the ebullitions of passion, were not so considerate and careful as they should have been, no candid and wise man will thence infer, that present parties are bad men, or their cause an iniquitous one. Because it is well known, that many bad things are often done by men by no means bad, and that a good cause is often defended in an unjustifiable manner. For illustration and confirmation of the facts here concisely stated, the best authorities, in addition to those already mentioned, are John le Clerc, in his *Historia Provinciarum Belgii Fœderati*, and his *Bibliothèque Choisie*, ii. 134, &c. and Hugo Grotius, in his *Apologeticus eorum, qui Hollandiæ Westfrisiæque et vicinis quibusdam nationibus ex legibus præfuerunt ante mutationem quæ evenit A.D. 1618*, Paris, 1640, 12mo, and often republished. The *Life of John van Oldenbarneveldt*, written in Dutch, was printed at the Hague, 1648, 4to. A history of the trial of the three celebrated Dutchmen above named, was elegantly compiled from authentic documents, by Gerhard Brandt, entitled, *Historie van de Rechtspleginge gehouden in den Jaaren 1618 en 1619, omtrent de drie gevangene Heeren Johan van Oldenbarneveldt, Rombout Hoogerbeets, Hugo de Groot*: of

which I have before me the third edition, with notes, Rotterdam, 1723, 4to. This whole subject receives also much light from the history of the life and actions of Hugo Grotius, very carefully compiled, chiefly from unpublished papers, by Caspar Brandt and Adrian Cattenburg. This great and noble work was published in two large volumes, entitled, *Historie van het Leven des Heeren Huig de Groot beschreven tot den Anfang van zyn Gesandtschap wegens de Koninginne en Kroone van Zweden aan't Hof van Vrankryck*, door Casp. Brandt, en vervolgt tot zyn Doodt door Adrian van Cattenburgh, Dordrecht en Amsterd. 1727, 2 vols. folio. Those who wish to get a near view and full knowledge of this great man, must by all means consult this great work; for all the other accounts of his life that are extant are insipid and unanimated, presenting only a shadow of this great hero. Nor is the most recent Life of Grotius, in French, by Burigny (republished, from the Paris edition, in Holland, 1753, 2 vols. 8vo), much better; at least it does not satisfy one who is desirous of a thorough knowledge of the transactions. [There appeared in Holland a warm vindication of the memory of this great man, in a work published at Delft, in 1727, and entitled, *Grotii Manes ab iniquis Obtreactionibus vindicati; accedit Scriptorum ejus tum editorum, tum ineditorum, Conspectus triplex*. Maccl.]

² [Macclaine says that if Mosheim had seen the *Letters, Memoirs, and Negotiations of Sir Dudley Carleton*, printed by Lord Hardwicke, he would have found out the pretext on which Oldenbarneveldt and Grotius were arrested. *Ed.*—Mosheim's

before a civil tribunal, because their alleged offence was not against the laws but the religion of the country. To procure their condemnation, therefore, a more religious tribunal, or a council, must be called; agreeably to the practice of the Genevans, who think that all spiritual matters and controversies should be decided in ecclesiastical councils.

§ 6. Without delay, delegates were assembled, at the instance of *Maurice*,¹ at Dort, a city in Holland, from the United Provinces, and from Hesse, England, the Palatinate, Bremen, and Switzerland, who held, in the years 1618 and 1619, what is called the Synod of Dort. Before it appeared to defend their cause the leading men of the Arminian sect; at the head of whom, and their chief orator, was *Simon Episcopus*, a disciple of *Arminius*, and professor of theology at Leyden, a man distinguished, as his enemies admit, for acuteness, learning, and fluency. But scarcely had *Episcopus* saluted the judges in a grave and eloquent address, when difficulties arose to interrupt the whole impending discussion. The Arminians wished to commence the defence of their cause by attacking the sentiments of their adversaries the Calvinists: this the judges disapproved, deciding that the accused must first explain and prove their own doctrines, before they proceeded to confute those who differed from them. Perhaps the Arminians hoped that a full exposure of the odious consequences which they could attach to the Calvinistic doctrine, would enkindle in the minds of the people present a hatred of it; while the Calvinists feared, lest the mighty genius and fine eloquence of *Episcopus* might injure their cause in the view of the multitude.² As the Arminians could by no means be persuaded to comply with the wishes of the synod, they were dismissed from the council, and complained that they had been treated unjustly. But the judges, after examining their published writings, pronounced them, though absent and unheard, guilty of corrupting theology, and holding pestilential errors: and in conformity with this sentence, that they

Latin is, 'crimini nescio quorum nomine;' which Schlegel here understands to mean, upon some unimportant charges. Tr.]

¹ [Our author always forgets to mention the order issued out by the *States-General*, for the convocation of this famous synod; and by his manner of expressing himself, and particularly by the phrase *Mauritio auctore*, would seem to insinuate that it was by the prince that this assembly was called together.—The legitimacy of the manner of convoking this synod was questioned by Oldenbarneveldt, who maintained that the *States-General* had no sort of authority in matters of religion, not even the power of assembling a synod, affirming that this was an act of sovereignty that belonged to each province separately and respectively.' See Carleton's Letters, &c. Maccl.]

² [Perhaps also another reason why both parties were so stiff on this point was, that

the members of the synod were not themselves of one mind in regard to the doctrine of predestination; for some of them were Supralapsarians, and others Infralapsarians; and in general, the doctrine of reprobation presented so many difficult points, that the members of the synod deemed it advisable to prescribe to the Remonstrants the mode of confutation and defence, and thus to retain in their own hands the direction of the whole discussion; while the Remonstrants hoped, perhaps, that the diversity of opinion among the members of the synod would prove advantageous to them if they could have liberty to expatiate widely on the doctrine of reprobation, and divide somewhat the votes of the judges. This is no improbable conjecture of Van Wagenaer, in his *Geschichte de Vereinigten Nederlande*, iv. 451. Schl.]

should be excluded from the communion of the church, and be deprived of authority to teach. That there was fault on both sides in this matter, no candid and good man will deny: but which party was more in the wrong, this is not the place to discuss.¹

§ 7. We cannot here descant upon either the purity and virtues, or the iniquity and faults, of the fathers at Dort. In extolling the former, the Calvinists, and in exaggerating the latter, the Arminians—if I do not misjudge—are over zealous and active.² That among the judges of the Arminians, there were men who were not only learned, but also honest and religious, who acted in great sincerity, and who had no suspicion that they were doing anything wrong, is not to be doubted at all. On the other hand, these facts are too clear and obvious to escape the sight of any one:—I. That the destruction of the Arminian sect was determined upon before the council was called;³ and that these fathers were called together, not to inquire

¹ The writers on the council of Dort are enumerated by Jo. Alb. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Græca*, xi. 723. The most copious of them all is Gerhard Brandt, in his *History of the Reformation in the Netherlands*, vol. ii. and iii. But as he was himself an Arminian, with his narration should be compared the work of James Leydecker, in which the purity and integrity of the synod of Dort are vindicated, in answer to Brandt: *Eere van de Nationale Synode van Dordrecht Voorgestaan en Bevestigd tegen de Beschuldigen van G. Brandt*, vol. i. Amster. 1705, vol. ii. 1707, 4to. After formally comparing them, I did not find any very enormous errors in Brandt: nor do these two writers disagree so much about the facts, as about the causes and import of the facts. John Hales, an Englishman, who belonged to neither party, has related simply what he saw: and his *Letters*, written from the scene of this council, I myself published some time ago, with notes, Hamburg, 1724, 8vo. [He was chaplain to the English ambassador at the Hague, Sir Dudley Carleton, and was king James's secret envoy, sent to watch the movements of the synod. His letters, addressed to Carleton, were published under the title of the *Golden Remains of the ever-memorable John Hales of Eton College*, 1659, 4to. Mosheim translated them into Latin, prefixed a long preface, and added some notes. *Tr.*]

² All that the Arminians deemed faulty in this council, they collected in a concise and neatly written book, frequently printed, *Nulliteyten, Mishandelinghen, end onbyllicke Proceduren des nationalen Synodi gehouden binnen Dordrecht, anno 1618, 1619, in't korte ende rouwe afgheworpen*, 1619, 4to.

³ [MacLaine says, 'This assertion is of too weighty a nature to be advanced without sufficient proof. Our author quotes no authority for it,'—Schlegel replies, 'The

proofs lie in the whole progress of the events. And a man must be ignorant of the human heart, and wholly unacquainted with the history of ecclesiastical councils, not to draw the natural conclusion, from what preceded the council, that the condemnation of the Arminians was already determined on, before the council was convened at Dort. The election of Bogermann, who possessed the soul of an inquisitor, to the presidency of the synod, would lead us to no other conclusion. The assessors of the president, and the scribes of the council, were known to be zealous Contra-Remonstrants. And so early as 1617, in the month of July, the Contra-Remonstrants declared, at the Hague, 'that they regarded the Remonstrants, and those who embraced the sentiments of the Remonstrants, to be false teachers (pro falsis doctoribus); and that they only waited for a national synod, of which there then appeared to be a bright prospect, so that in it there might be made a legitimate secession from the Remonstrants, which should be put in execution after an ecclesiastical trial. See Phil. a Limborch's *Relatio Historica de Origine et Progressu Controversiarum in Fœderato Belgio*, p. 18. The provincial synods, that were held before the synod of Dort, so arranged everything as to give the Contra-Remonstrants the upperhand. In particular, they deposed Remonstrant ministers, as e.g. Uytenbogaerd, Grevinchovius, and others. And in electing ministers to attend the national synod, the Remonstrants were wholly passed by; and only from the district of Utrecht were two Remonstrant delegates sent to Dort, and even these were excluded, as soon as the cause of the Remonstrants came on. See Limborch, *loc. cit.* and Wagenaer's *History of the United Netherlands* (in German), iv. 446, &c. Thus far Schlegel. — Undoubtedly, nearly or quite every minister in Holland had an opinion formed,

whether this sect might be tolerated or not, but to promulge a sentence long before passed, with some becoming formality, with the appearance of justice, and with the consent of the foreign theologians.—II. That the enemies and accusers of the Arminians were their judges; and that the president of the council, *John Bogermann*,¹ exceeded almost all others in hatred of this sect.—III. That neither the Dutch nor the foreign divines had liberty to decide according to their own pleasure, but were obliged to decide according to the instructions which they brought with them from their princes and magistrates.²—IV. That, in the council itself, the voice of the illustrious and very honourable men who appeared as the legates of *Maurice* and the States-General, had more influence than that of the theologians who sat as the judges.—V. That the promise made to the Arminians when summoned before the council, *that they should have liberty to state, explain, and defend their opinions as far as they were able, and deemed it necessary*, was violated by the council.³

§ 8. The Arminians, being adjudged enemies of their country and of religion, were subjected to severe animadversion. First, they

with regard to the correctness of the doctrines of the Remonstrants, and the propriety of permitting their propagation. It could not be otherwise, as these opinions had been preached and published, abundantly, for ten years, and had been the great theme of discussion among theologians. In such circumstances, to be ignorant of the Arminian doctrines, or to have no opinion concerning them, would have been altogether unbecoming in a clergyman. It was therefore a thing of course, and no reproach upon their characters, that the divines at Dort should come together with opinions already made up on the *theological* questions they were to discuss. *Tr.*]

¹ [Bogermann was minister of Leeuwarden, an avowed enemy of the Arminians, who had already written against them, and who was so full of the persecuting spirit of Beza, that he had translated into Dutch Beza's book, *de Hæreticis a Magistratu puniendis*. And his whole behaviour at the synod showed that he was better qualified to be the papal legate at a council of Trent than the moderator of a Protestant synod. *Schl.*—Bogermann was doubtless too zealous, and in several instances too severe and passionate in his speeches. But his intolerant spirit was the spirit of the age. Christian forbearance and tenderness towards the erring was then nowhere well understood and duly practised. *Tr.*]

² ['Here our author has fallen into a palpable mistake. The Dutch divines had no commission, but from their respective consistories, or subordinate ecclesiastical assemblies; nor are they ever the depositaries of the orders of their magistrates,

who have lay deputies to represent them both in provincial and national synods. As to the English and other *foreign* doctors that appeared in the synod of Dort, the case perhaps may have been somewhat different.' *Macl.*]

³ See Mich. le Vassor's *Hist. du Règne de Louis XIII.*, t. iii. livr. xii. p. 365, 366, and my notes on J. Hales' *Historia Concilii Dordraceni*, p. 394—400. [The words of the promise were, 'Liberum illis fore, ut proponant, explicent, et defendant, quantum possent et necessarium judicarent, opiniones SUAS.' This promise, the Arminians contended, gave them liberty to state as many of their own doctrines, and in such an order, as they pleased; and also to state their views of the sentiments or doctrines of their opposers, and to refute them, as fully and in such a manner as they pleased. Whether this was a fair and reasonable construction of the words of the promise, and such a construction as the synod was bound to admit, the reader will judge. Yet it was the refusal of this, and the requiring the Remonstrants to state and defend only *their own* sentiments, and to proceed in regard to them methodically, that the Remonstrants complained of, as a violation of the promise made them. See the Remonstrants' views of a proper council, presented to the Synod, December 10th; the decree of the Synod of the 29th Dec., and the synod's explanation of it, December 29; and also the communication of the Remonstrants to the synod, on the 21st of January: all which documents are given by the Remonstrants themselves, in their *Acta et Scripta Synodalia Dordracena*, pt. i. p. 4, &c. 140, &c. 159, &c. *Tr.*]

were all deprived both of their sacred and their civil offices; and then, their preachers were ordered to refrain from preaching altogether. Such as would not submit to this order, were ignominiously sent into exile, and subjected to other punishments and indignities. Hence many retired to Antwerp, and others to France; and a large body of them emigrated to Holstein, by the invitation of *Frederic* duke of Holstein, and built the handsome town of *Frederickstadt* in the duchy of Sleswick. In that town the Arminians still live in tranquillity, and enjoy the free exercise of their religion. The leaders of this colony were men of distinction in Holland, especially *Adrian van der Wahl*, the first governor of the town of *Frederickstadt*.¹ Among the clergymen who accompanied this colony, the most distinguished were, the famous *Conrad Vorst*, who drew a great deal of odium upon the Arminians by his sentiments, which were not very remote from those of the Socinians; *Nicholas Grevinchovius*, a man of acuteness, who had been a pastor at Rotterdam; *Simon Goulart*; *John Grevius*; *Marcus Walther*; *John Narsius*; and others.²

§ 9. *Maurice*, under whose government the Arminians suffered so greatly, died in 1625. By the clemency of his brother and successor, *Frederic Henry*, the Arminian exiles were recalled, and restored to their former reputation and tranquillity. Those therefore returned who had retired to France and to the Spanish Netherlands: and they established congregations distinct from the Reformed, in various places, and particularly at Rotterdam and Amsterdam. In order to have a seminary for their own sect and religion, they founded a distinguished school at Amsterdam, in which two professors train up young men for the ministry, the one teaching theology, and the other history, philosophy, and the learned languages. *Simon Episcopius* was the first professor of Arminian theology; and after him, these offices have been filled, down to the present time, by men highly famed for learning and genius, namely, *Stephen Curcellæus*, *Arnold Poellenburg*, *Philip Limborch*, *John le Clerc*, *Adrian van Cattenburg*,³ and *John James Wetstein*.

¹ The history of this colony may be learned from the noted *Epistolæ præstantium et eruditorum virorum ecclesiasticæ et theologicæ*, published by Phil. Limborch and Christ. Hartsoecker; the latest ed. Amsterd. 1704, fol. Compare Jo. Möller's *Introductio in Histor. Chersonesi Cimbricæ*, pt. ii. p. 108, &c. and Eric Pontoppidan's *Annales Ecclesiæ Danicæ Diplomatici*, iii. 714, &c.

² Concerning Vorst, Jo. Möller treats very fully, in his *Cimbria Litterata*, ii. 931, &c. He also treats expressly of the other persons here mentioned; *ibid.* ii. 242, 247, 249, 255, 576.

³ Of these and the other Arminian writers, Adrian van Cattenburg treats expressly, in his *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Remonstrantium*, Amsterd. 1728, 4to. [Episcopius was born at Amsterdam, a pupil of Arminius, and

after the deposition of Vorst, his successor at Leyden; an eloquent and acute man, who, being full of theological scepticism, began to question many of the received opinions, *e.g.* the doctrine of original sin. He died in 1643, as professor in the Arminian Gymnasium at Amsterdam. His life, written by Limborch, and his writings, were published by Curcellæus and Poellenburg, Amsterd. 1650, 1665, 2 vols. fol.—Curcellæus (Courcelles) was born at Geneva, of French parentage, and early showed a propensity towards Arminianism, which he defended against the decrees of Dort. He died in 1659, an Arminian professor at Amsterdam. His theological works were published collectively by Limborch, Amsterd. 1675, fol. His fine edition of the Greek New Testament, with various read-

§ 10. The Remonstrants, as we have seen, differed at first from the Reformed in nothing, except the five propositions concerning grace and predestination; and it was on this ground that they were condemned at the synod of Dort. They moreover so explained those five propositions, that they seemed to teach precisely what the Lutherans do. But from the time of the synod of Dort, and still more, after the exiles were allowed to return to their country, they professed an entirely new species of religion, different from the views of all other sects of Christians. For most of them not only gave such an explanation of these propositions as seemed to differ very little from the views of those who deny that a man needs any divine aid in order to his conversion and living a holy life, but they also lowered down very much most of the doctrines of Christianity by subjecting them to the modifications of reason and ingenuity. *James Arminius*, the parent of the sect, undoubtedly invented this form of theology, and taught it to his followers;¹ but it was *Simon Episcopius*, the

ings, is well known.—Pöllenburg was born at Horn, in the Netherlands, where he became a preacher. Thence he was removed to Amsterdam as a preacher; was made successor to Curcellæus in his professorship there, and died in 1666.—Limborch was brother's grandson to Simon Episcopius, first a preacher at Gouda, and then at Amsterdam, and lastly professor there; where he also died in 1712. He was a modest theologian, who united great learning with extraordinary clearness of style in his writings. This is manifest by his *Theologia Christiana*. Also his *Amica Collatio cum erudito Judæo de Veritate Religionis Christianæ*, his *Historia Inquisitionis*, and his collection of the Epistles of Remonstrants, are important works; as likewise his very temperately written *Relatio Historica de Origine et Progressu Controversiar. in Fœderato Belgio de Prædestinatione et capitib. annexis*.—Le Clerc was born and educated at Geneva, and professor of Hebrew, philosophy, and the fine arts, and afterwards of church history, in the Arminian Gymnasium at Amsterdam; and died in 1736, aged 79. His *Epistolæ Theologicæ*, under the name of Liberius de S. Amore; *Sentimens de quelques Théologiens de Hollande sur l'Histoire Critique du V. T.*, par R. Simon; his Journals (periodical works, containing analyses and reviews of works, with original essays interspersed), namely, *Bibliothèque Universelle et Historique* (1686—1693, in 26 thick vols. 12mo), *Bibliothèque Choisie* (1703—1713, in 28 vols. 12mo), *Bibliothèque Ancienne et Moderne* (1714—1727, in 29 vols. 12mo), his *Commentaries on the Old Testament*; *Ars Critica*; *Harmony of the Gospels*; *Histoire des Provinces unies des Pays bas* (from 1560 to 1728, in 3 vols. fol.—his *Historia Litteraria*

duorum primorum a Christo Sæculorum, 1716, 4to), and his editions of classical and other authors, have procured him a great name among the learned.—Cattenburg was professor of theology, in the Arminian Gymnasium at Amsterdam till 1730. He wrote *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Remonstrantium*; *Spicilegium Theologiæ Christianæ Limborchianæ*; and some works explanatory of the Bible.—Wetstein succeeded Le Clerc, after being deposited at Basle, and died in 1754 (aged 61). His critical edition of the New Testament (1751—2, in 2 vols. fol.) is well known. *Schl.*]

¹ It is a common opinion, that the early Arminians, who flourished before the synod of Dort, were much purer and more sound than the later ones, who lived and taught after that council; and that Arminius himself only rejected Calvin's doctrine of absolute decrees, and its necessary consequences, while in everything else he agreed with the Reformed: but that his disciples, and especially Episcopius, boldly passed the limits which their master had wisely established, and went over to the camp of the Pelagians and Socinians. But it appears to me very clear, that Arminius himself designed in his own mind, and taught to his disciples, that form of religion which his followers afterwards professed; and that the latter, especially Episcopius, only perfected what their master taught them, and, casting off fear, explained it more clearly. I have as a witness, besides others of less authority, Arminius himself, who, in his *Will*, drawn up a little before his death, explicitly declares, that his aim was to bring all sects of Christians, with the exception of the Papists, into one community and brotherhood. We will cite his words, from Peter Bertius' *Funeral Oration on Arminius*,

first master in the Arminian school after its founder, and a very ingenious man, who digested and polished it, and reduced it to a regular system.¹

§ 11. The whole system of the Remonstrants is directed to this one single object, to unite the hearts of Christians, who are divided by a variety of sentiments and opinions, and to gather them into one fraternity or family, notwithstanding they may differ in many points of doctrine and worship. To accomplish this object, they maintain that *Christ* does not require of his followers to *believe* much, but to *do* much, or to cultivate love and virtue: and they give a very broad definition of a true Christian. For, according to them, every person belongs to the kingdom of Christ, who—I. receives the holy Scriptures, and particularly the New Testament, as the rule of his faith, whatever may be the interpretation he gives to those books;—II. is opposed to the worship of many gods, and to whatever is connected with such an abomination;—III. leads an upright life, conformable to the divine law;—and IV. never troubles or disturbs those who differ from him on religious subjects, or who interpret the books of the New Testament in a different manner from what he does. By these principles a wide door is opened to all who honour Christ, though very much at variance in sentiments, to enter into the Arminian communion. Yet the papists are excluded from it, because they think it right to persecute and to put to death such as oppose the Roman prelate.²

p. 15. 'Ea proposui atque docui——que ad propagationem, amplificationemque veritatis, religionis Christianæ, veri Dei cultus, communis pietatis, et sanctæ inter homines conversationis, denique ad convenientem Christiano nomini tranquillitatem et pacem juxta verbum Dei possent conferre, excludens ex iis Papatum, cum quo nulla unitas fidei, nullum pietatis aut Christianæ pacis vinculum servari potest.' Now what, I ask, is this, but that very Arminianism of more recent times, which extends so widely the boundaries of the Christian church, that all sects may live harmoniously within them, whatever opinions they may hold, except only the professors of the Romish religion? [The opinion, that Arminius himself was very nearly orthodox, and not an Arminian, has been recently advocated by professor Stuart of Andover, in an article expressly On the Creed of Arminius, in the *Biblical Repository*, No. ii. Andover, 1831. See p. 293 and 301. To such a conclusion the learned professor is led, principally, by an artful and imposing statement, made by Arminius to the magistrates of Holland in 1608, one year before his death, on which Mr. Stuart puts the most favourable construction the words will bear. But from a careful comparison of this declaration of Arminius with the original *Five Articles* of the Arminian creed (which were drawn up almost in the

very words of Arminius so early as 1610, and exhibited by the Remonstrants in the conference at the Hague in 1611, and were afterwards, together with a full explanation and vindication of each article, laid before the synod of Dort in 1617, changing, however, the dubitation of the *fifth* article into a positive denial of the saints' perseverance), it will, I think, appear manifest, that Arminius himself actually differed from the orthodox of that day on all the five points, and that he agreed substantially with the Remonstrants on all those doctrines for which they were condemned in the synod of Dort. And that such was the fact, appears to have been assumed without hesitation by the principal writers of that and the following age, both Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants. Tr.]

¹ A life of this celebrated man, which is well worth reading, was composed by Philip Limborch, and first published in Dutch, and then, more full and complete, in Latin, Amsterd. 1701, 8vo.

² In place of all others, may here be read, the tract of Simon Episcopus, entitled, *Verus Theologus Remonstrans, sive Veræ Remonstrantium Theologiæ de errantibus dilucida declaratio*, which is extant in his *Opera*, i. 508, &c., and, like the rest of his productions, is neatly and perspicuously written. John le Clerc sums up the doctrines of his sect, in the Dedication of his

And, indeed, if other Christians would abide by these precepts, the great diversities of opinion among them would, clearly, be no obstacle to their mutual love and concord.

§ 12. It hence appears, that the Arminian community was composed of persons of various descriptions; and that it had, properly, no fixed and stable form of religion, or, to use a common phrase, no *system* of religion. They would not, indeed, wish to be thought destitute of a bond of union, and therefore they show us a sort of Confession of faith, drawn up with sufficient neatness, by *Simon Episcopus*, for the most part in the very words of the sacred writers, and which they represent as their formula and rule of faith.¹ But as none of their teachers are so tied to this formula, by oath or promise, as not to be at liberty to depart from it; and on the contrary, as every one, from the constitution of the sect, is allowed to construe it according to his own pleasure,—and it is capable of different expositions,—it must be manifest, that we cannot determine at all, from this Confession, what they approve and what they reject. And hence their public teachers advance very different sentiments respecting the most weighty doctrines of the Christian religion.² Nor do they in scarcely anything take one fixed and uniform course, except in regard to the doctrines of predestination and grace. For they all continue to assert, most carefully, though in a very different manner from their fathers, the doctrine which excluded their predecessors from the pale of the Reformed church; namely, that the love of God embraces the whole human race, and that no one perishes through any eternal and insuperable decree of God, but all merely by their own fault. Whoever attacks this doctrine attacks the whole school or sect: but one who may assail any other doctrines contained in the writings of Arminius, must know that he has no controversy with the Arminian *church*, the theology of which, with few exceptions, is unsettled and fluctuating, but only with some of its doctors, who do not all interpret and explain in the same manner, even that one doctrine of the universal love of God to mankind, which especially separates the Arminians from the Reformed.

Latin translation of Hammond's New Testament, which is addressed to the learned among the Remonstrants, in this manner, p. 3: 'Profiteri soletis — eos duntaxat a vobis excludi, qui (I.) idololatria sunt contaminati, (II.) qui minime habent Scripturam pro fidei norma, (III.) qui impuris moribus sancta Christi præcepta conculcant, (IV.) aut qui denique alios religionis caussa vexant.'—Many tell us that the Arminians regard as brethren all who merely assent to what is called the *Apostles' Creed*. But a very competent witness, John le Clerc, shows that this is a mistake: *Bibliothèque Ancienne et Moderne*, xxv. 119. 'Ils se trompent: Ils (les Arminiens) offrent la communion à tous ceux qui reçoivent l'Ecriture Sainte comme la seule règle de la foi et des mœurs,

et qui ne sont ni idolâtres ni persécuteurs.'

¹ This Confession is extant in Latin, Dutch, and German. The Latin may be seen in the Works of Episcopus, t. ii. pt. ii. p. 69; where also, p. 97, may be seen an *Apology* for this Confession, by the same Episcopus, written against the divines of the university of Leyden.

² This any one may see, with his own eyes, by only comparing together the writings of Episcopus, Curcellæus, Limborch, Le Clerc, and Cattenburg. [Those Arminians who agree with the Reformed in all doctrinal points, except the Five Articles contained in their remonstrance, are, for distinction's sake, called *Quinquarticulans*. *Schl.*]

§ 13. The Arminian community, at the present time, is very small, if compared with the Reformed: and, if common report be true, it is decreasing continually. They have at present [1753] thirty-four congregations in Holland, some smaller, and some larger; over which are forty-four ministers: out of Holland they have one at Frederickstadt. But the principles adopted by their founders have spread with wonderful rapidity over many nations, and gained the approbation of vast numbers. For—to say nothing of the English, who adopted the Arminian doctrines concerning grace and predestination as early as the times of *William Laud*, and who, on the restoration of *Charles II.*, assented in great measure to the other Arminian tenets—who is so ignorant of the state of the world as not to know, that in many of the courts of Protestant princes, and almost everywhere among those who pretend to be wise, this sentiment, which is the basis of Arminianism, is prevalent; namely, that very few things are necessary to be believed in order to salvation; and that every one is to be allowed to think as he pleases, concerning God and religion, provided he lives a pious and upright life? The Hollanders themselves, though they acknowledge that the sect which their fathers condemned is gradually declining in numbers and strength, yet publicly lament that its opinions are spreading further and further, and that even those to whose care the decrees of the council of Dort were intrusted, are corrupted by them. How much inclined towards them are many of the Swiss, especially the Genevans, and also many of the French, is very well known.¹ The form of church government and the mode of worship among the Arminians are very nearly the same as among the Reformed of the *Presbyterian* churches. Yet the leaders of the sect, as they neglect no means tending to preserve and strengthen their communion with the English church, so they show themselves very friendly to episcopal government; and they do not hesitate to affirm that they regard it as a holy form, very ancient and preferable to the other forms of government.²

¹ [Dr. Maclaine has here a long and elaborate note on the tendency of the Leibnitian and Wolfian philosophy to support Calvinism. The reasoning is ingenious and good. But the effects actually produced by this philosophy seem to be greatly overrated, when he says, ‘that the progress of Arminianism has been greatly retarded, nay, that its cause daily declines in Germany and several parts of Switzerland, in consequence of the ascendant which the Leibnitian and Wolfian philosophy hath gained in these countries, and particularly among the clergy and men of learning.’ When Dr. Maclaine wrote thus, about 1763, the Germans were going fast into what is called

German *neology*, and the Swiss approximating towards Socinianism; and the philosophy he speaks of was rapidly waning. *Tr.*]

² Hence,—to omit many other things which place this beyond doubt,—they have taken so much pains to show, that Hugo Grotius, their hero and almost their oracle, commended the English church in the highest degree, and that he preferred it before all others. See the collection of proofs for this, by John le Clerc, subjoined to his edition of Grotius’ book, *de Veritate Religionis Christianæ*, p. 376, ed. Hague, 1724, 8vo.

CHAPTER V.

HISTORY OF THE QUAKERS.

§ 1. Origin of the Quakers. George Fox—§ 2. First movements of the sect under Cromwell—§ 3. Progress in the times of Charles II. and James II.—§ 4. Propagation out of England—§ 5. Their controversies—§ 6. Their religion generally—§ 7. First Principle—§ 8. Its consequences—§ 9. Concerning Christ—§ 10. Discipline and worship—§ 11. Moral doctrines—§ 12. Form of government.

§ 1. THOSE who in English are called *Quakers*, are in Latin called *Trementes* or *Tremuli*. This name was given them, in the year 1650, by *Gervas Bennet*, a justice of the peace in Derbyshire;¹ but whether because their whole body trembled before they began to speak on religious subjects, or because *Fox* and his associates said that a man ought to tremble at hearing the Word of God, does not sufficiently appear. In the mean time they suffer themselves to be called by this name, provided it be correctly understood. They prefer, however, to be named, from their primary doctrine, *Children* or *Confessors of the light*. In familiar discourse they call each other *Friends*.² The origin of the sect falls on those times in English history when civil war raged universally, and when every one who had conceived in his mind a new form, either of civil government or of religion, came forth with it from his obscure retreat into public view. Its parent was *George Fox*, a shoemaker, a man naturally very gloomy, shunning society, and peculiarly fitted to form visionary conceptions. As early as the year 1647, when he was twenty-three years old, he travelled over some of the counties of England, giving out that he was full of the Spirit, and exhorting the people to attend to the voice of the divine word, which lies concealed in the hearts of all. After *Charles I.* was beheaded, when both civil and ecclesiastical laws seemed to be extinguished together, he attempted greater things. For having acquired numerous disciples and friends among persons of a similar temperament with himself, and of both sexes, in connexion with them he set all England in commotion; nay, in 1650, he broke up assemblies for the public worship of God, where he was able, as being useless and not truly Christian.³ For this reason he and his asso-

¹ See George [William] Sewel's *History of the Quakers*, p. 23 [vol. i. p. 43, ed. Lond. 1811.] Daniel Neal's *History of the Puritans*, iv. 32, &c. [ed. Boston, 1817, p. 60, 61; where see Toulmin's note. *Tr.*]

² Sewel, *loc. cit.* p. 624. [ii. 589, ed. Lond. 1811; also Dan. Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, iv. 60, 61, ed. Boston, 1817. *Tr.*]

³ [Fox and his adherents looked upon all worship of God, that did not proceed imme-

diately from the impulse of the Spirit within, as abominable in the sight of God. Hence he had no reverence for the religious worship of most of the sects of Christians around him. Yet it does not appear that he felt it to be his duty to attempt, forcibly, to interrupt or suppress such worship. But feeling bound always to obey the impulse of the Spirit, and supposing himself to have this impulse while in or near the places of worship, he sometimes was led to

ciates were several times thrown into prison, and chastised by the magistrates.¹

speak in them, to the annoyance of the congregation, and was treated as a disturber of public worship. Three instances are mentioned, all occurring in 1649. The first was at Nottingham, and is thus related by Sewel, i. 36, ed. 1811. He 'went away to the steeple-house, where the priest took for his text these words of the apostle Peter, *We have a most (more) sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts.* And he told the people that this was the *Scripture*, by which they were to try all doctrines, religions, and opinions. G. Fox, hearing this, felt such mighty power and godly zeal working in him, that he was made to cry out, O! no, it is not the Scripture, but it is the *Holy Spirit*, by which the holy men of God gave forth the Scriptures, whereby opinions, religions, and judgments are to be tried. That was *it*, which led into all truth, and gave the knowledge thereof. For the Jews had the Scriptures, and yet resisted the Holy Ghost, and rejected Christ, the bright morning-star, and persecuted him and his apostles, though they took upon them to try their doctrine by the Scriptures; but they erred in judgment, and did not try them aright, because they did it without the Holy Ghost. Thus speaking, the officers came and took him away, and put him in a nasty stinking prison.'—The next instance was at Mansfield, and is thus related by the same author, vol. i. p. 38. 'Whilst G. Fox was in this place, he was moved to go to the steeple-house, and declare there the truth to the priest and the people; which doing, the people fell upon him, and struck him down, almost smothering him, for he was cruelly beaten and bruised with their hands, bibles, and sticks. Then they hauled him out, though hardly able to stand, and put him into the stocks, where he sat some hours; and they brought horse-whips, threatening to whip him. After some time they had him before the magistrates, at a knight's house, who, seeing how ill he had been used, set him at liberty, after much threatening. But the rude multitude stoned him out of the town.'—The third instance occurred at Market Bosworth, and is thus concisely stated by Sewel, i. 39, &c. 'Coming into the public place of worship, he (Fox) found Nathaniel Stephens preaching, who, as hath been said already, was priest of the town where G. Fox was born; here G. Fox taking occasion to speak, Stephens told the people he was mad, and that they should not hear him, though he

had said before to one colonel Purfoy, concerning him, that there was never such a plant bred in England. The people now being stirred up by this priest, fell upon G. Fox and his friends, and stoned them out of the town.' See a Refutation of erroneous statements, &c. by authority of the Yearly Meeting of Friends for New England, dated New Bedford, 12th month 9, 1811, subjoined to Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* ed. New York, 1824, iv. 295, &c. Neal's *Hist. of Purit. ed.* Toulmin, Boston, 1817, iv. 58, 59. Tr.]

¹ Besides the common historians of this century, see especially Gerh. Croesius (Croese), a Dutch clergyman's, *Historia Quakeriana tribus libris comprehensa*, ed. 2, Amsterd. 1703, 8vo. On this, however, Kohlhans [under the name of Philalethes], a doctor of physic, a Lutheran who became a Quaker, published *Dilucidationes* (explanations), Amsterd. 1696, 8vo. And undoubtedly Croese's book, though neatly written, contains numerous errors. Yet the French history of the Quakers, *Histoire abrégée de la Naissance et du Progrès du Kouakerisme, avec celle de ses Dogmes*, Cologne, 1692, 12mo, is much worse. For the author does not so much state what he found to be facts, as heap together things true and false, without discrimination, in order to produce a ludicrous account. See Gerh. Croese's *Hist. Quakeriana*, lib. ii. p. 322 and 376, and John le Clerc's *Bibliothèque Universelle et Hist.* xxii. 53, &c. But altogether the most full and authentic, being derived from numerous credible documents, and in part from the writings of Fox himself, is the Quaker, George [William] Sewel's *History of the Christian People called Quakers* [first written in Dutch, and translated by the author into English, Lond. 1722, fol. and 1811, 2 vols. 8vo], translated from the English into German, and printed 1742, fol. This work exhibits great research, as well as fidelity: yet on points dishonourable or disadvantageous to the Quakers, he dissembles, conceals, and beclouds not a little. Still, the statements of Sewel are sufficient to enable a discerning and impartial man to form a just estimate of this sect. Voltaire, also, has treated of the religion, the morals, and the history of these people, though rather to amuse than to enlighten the reader, in four letters, written with his usual elegance: *Mélanges de Littérature et de Philosophie; Œuvres*, tom. iv. cap. iii.—vi. p. 160, &c. [With which compare *A Letter from one of the people called Quakers* (Josiah Martin) to Francis de Voltaire, Lond. 1742.] In general, what he says is true and to be relied

§ 2. The first association of Quakers was composed, in great measure, of infatuated and fanatical persons; and therefore committed many acts which the more temperate Quakers of the present day extenuate indeed, but by no means commend or approve. For most of them, both male and female, declaimed vehemently against all other religions; assailed the public worship and the ministers of religion with insult and abuse; treated the commands of magistrates and the laws with contempt, under the pretence of conscience and a divine impulse; and greatly disturbed both the church and the state. It is therefore not strange that many of them often suffered severe punishments for their rashness and folly.¹ *Cromwell*, though otherwise not

on, being derived from Andrew Pitt, a Quaker of London; but the witty man, to render his account more entertaining, has adorned it with poetic colouring, and added some things of his own. From these works, chiefly, was compiled, though not with due accuracy, the Dissertation on the Religion of the Quakers, in that splendid work, *Cérémonies et Coutumes Religieuses de tous les Peuples du Monde*, iv. 124, &c. Among us, Fred. Ern. Meis published a small German work concerning this sect, especially the English portion of it, *Entwurf des Kirchen-Ordnung und Gebräuche der Quäcker in Engelland*, 1715, 8vo. [Later works are, John Gough's *History of the People called Quakers*, Lond. 1789, 3 vols. 8vo. Thomas Clarkson's *Portraiture of Quakerism*, 3 vols. 8vo. Lond. and New York, 1806. A Summary of the history, doctrines, and discipline of Friends, written at the desire of the Meeting for Sufferings in London, 1800, and subjoined to Mosheim's *Eccles. Hist.* ed. New York, 1824, iv. 307—327; also Joshua Toulmin, D.D. Supplements annexed to his edition of Neal's *Hist. of the Puritans*, iv. 296—308, 518—552, and v. 126—140, 245—261. Tr.]

¹ See Neal's *History of the Puritans*, iv. 153, &c. [ed. 1817, p. 174, &c.] Sewel's *Hist. of the Quakers*, in various places. [Neal, in the passage just named, gives account of the offensive conduct of some of the first Quakers, and of the punishments to which they were subjected. And Dr. Toulmin, in his notes, corrects the statements of Neal, and vindicates the Quakers. The story of James Nayler is there stated. This honest enthusiast, who had been an admired speaker among the Quakers, very improperly suffered some misguided individuals to style him the *everlasting Son of righteousness*; the *Prince of peace*; the *only begotten Son of God*; the *fairest among ten thousand*. He likewise allowed some of them to kiss his feet, when imprisoned at Exeter; and after his release, to conduct him in triumph to Bristol; one man walking bareheaded before him; another, a

woman, leading his horse; and others spreading their scarfs and handkerchiefs in the way, and crying, *Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of Hosts; Hosanna in the highest; holy, holy, is the Lord God of Israel*. The magistrates of Bristol caused him to be apprehended, and transmitted him to the parliament, who tried him for blasphemy. He alleged that these honours were not paid to him, but to *Christ who dwelt in him*, and said, 'If they had it from the Lord, what had I to do to reprove them? If the Father has moved them to give these honours to Christ, I may not deny them; if they have given them to any other but to Christ, I disown them.' 'I do abhor, that any honours due to God, should be given to me, as I am a creature; but it pleased the Lord to set me up as a sign of the coming of the righteous One; and what has been done to me passing through the town, I was commanded by the power of the Lord to suffer to be done to the outward man as a sign; but I abhor any honour as a creature.' Manifest as it was that the man was beside himself, and had no intention to allow divine honours to be paid to himself, he was condemned to be branded, have his tongue bored with a hot iron, sit in the pillory, be whipped through the streets of London and Bristol, and thence to be imprisoned during the pleasure of parliament: and this cruel sentence was executed. But during his imprisonment he came to his senses, and very fully and penitently acknowledged his fault. The great body of Quakers at the time expressly disapproved his conduct; and they promptly ejected him from their community, but afterwards, upon his repentance, restored him. Such in substance is the famous case of James Nayler; which, though a solitary case, and disapproved at the time by the mass of the Quakers, has continued to this day to occasion high censure to be cast upon the whole sect.—That the early Quakers sometimes mistook the conclusions of their own minds for suggestions of the Spirit, and that they needlessly adopted

hostile to any sect, yet was afraid of this turbulent multitude; and at first he determined to suppress it. But when he perceived that all his promises and his threatenings could make no impression on them, he prudently refrained, and deemed it advisable merely to take care that they should not excite seditions among the people, and weaken the foundations of his power.¹

§ 3. Gradually, however, the excessive ardour of the rising sect subsided, as was natural to expect; and that divine light to which the Quakers made pretensions by degrees ceased to disturb the commonwealth. In the reign of *Charles II.*, both their religion and their discipline assumed a more definite and fixed character. In this business *Fox* was assisted especially by *Robert Barclay*, a Scotch gentleman, *George Keith*, and *Samuel Fisher*; learned men who had connected themselves with his sect.² For these three men digested and reduced

odious singularities, or did not comply so far as they ought with the customs and usages of society, nor treat the religion of others with that respect and decorum which are necessary to the peace of a community in which various religions are tolerated, many will think to be very manifest. Yet, on the other hand, there was doubtless a great want of candour and forbearance towards them. Their errors were magnified, and their indiscretions punished as high-handed crimes. One of their own writers (*Gough, Hist. of the Quakers*, i. 139, &c.) says, ‘A Christian exhortation to an assembly, after the priest had done and the worship was over, was denominated *interrupting* public worship, and disturbing the priest in his office; an honest testimony against sin in the streets or markets was styled a *breach of the peace*; and their appearing before the magistrates covered, a *contempt of authority*; hence proceeded *fines, imprisonments, and spoiling of goods.*’ Mosheim’s representation of the modern Quakers as more moderate and decorous than their fathers in the days of Cromwell, seems to be in general correct. Yet the author of a refutation of erroneous statements relative to the society of Quakers (in Mosheim’s *Ecol. Hist.* iv. 304, &c.), makes the following remarks, which are worthy of being inserted here. ‘Dr. Mosheim has in several instances endeavoured to impress the reader with the idea that the ancient and modern Quakers were entirely different people, both in respect to their principles and conduct. This is the more worthy of notice, as it is an error not by any means peculiar to him, but which in a degree prevails very generally. We view the modern Quakers with our own proper vision, and through a medium cleared from the discolorations of that through which we view the ancient; they appear to us a quiet, orderly, moral, and religious people. But

in the accounts transmitted to us by their enemies, we view the ancient Quakers through a discoloured medium, a vision extremely acrimonious, and tinged with bile; and they appear to us fanatic, turbulent, and riotous. If we were to imagine to ourselves the modern Quakers passing through our country, as they actually do, seeking and conversing with sober inquirers, appointing meetings for religious worship; and if at the same time we were to imagine a mob of dissolute and enraged rabble at their heels, scoffing and beating them with sticks and stones, to interrupt their meetings, without the least marks of violence or even of defensive resistance to any on their part;—if we imagine some unworthy ministers and magistrates rather instigating their fury, the latter sending them to prison, charged with the riots to which themselves had been accessory; the Quakers submitting to all, with a patience unconquerable, yet pursuing their mission with undeviating perseverance, not to be paralleled in history since the days of the first promulgators of the Christian faith;—we might then perhaps view a true picture of the ancient Quakers; their principles, their doctrine, and their manners being the same.’ *Tr.*]

¹ Clarendon tells us, in his *History of the Rebellion and of the Civil Wars in England* [French ed.], vi. 437, that the Quakers remained always violent enemies to Cromwell. See Sewel, *l. c.* book iii. p. 91, 113, 148, 149, &c. [ed. 1811, i. 168, 209, 273, 275, &c.]

² Respecting Barclay, see *Nouveau Dictionnaire Hist. et Crit.* i. 67, &c. Respecting Keith, see Sewel, *Hist. of the Quakers*, p. 429, 490, 544, 560. Respecting Fisher, see the *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, A.D. 1750, p. 338, &c. [Robert Barclay was descended from an honourable family, but was not a Knight [as Murdock translated *Eques*]. For

to fixed principles the loose and vague discipline of *Fox*, who was an illiterate man.¹ Yet for a long time these wiser and more quiet Quakers had to endure even more suffering and calamity in England than the insane and turbulent had experienced; though not so much for their religion as for their manners and customs. For as they would not address magistrates by their honorary titles, and pay them customary respect; as they refused the oath of allegiance to the king; and as they would not pay tithes to the clergy; they were looked upon as bad citizens and dangerous men, and were often severely punished.²

the history of him the Quakers refer us to the account of him by William Penn and others, his contemporaries, prefixed to the edition of his works in folio, 1692. For the life of Fisher they refer us to William Penn's account of him, annexed to Fisher's Works, fol. 1679. *Tr.*]

¹ [The Quakers consider this statement of Mosheim as being unjust to the character of George Fox. And indeed, William Penn, who certainly knew Fox's character well, and was no incompetent judge of men, in his preface to Fox's Journal, says, 'He was a man that God endowed with a clear and wonderful depth, a discernor of others' spirits, and very much a master of his own. --In all things he acquitted himself like a man, a new and heavenly-minded man, a divine and a naturalist, and all of God Almighty's making. I have been surprised at his questions and answers in natural things, that whilst he was ignorant of useless and sophistical science he had in him the foundation of useful and commendable knowledge, and cherished it everywhere.' As to the Quaker discipline, their monthly meetings, &c., the records of the sect, they tell us, contain nothing from which it may be inferred that Barclay, Keith, and Fisher had any share in its formation; or that it was not chiefly, if not wholly, brought into form and operation by Fox. He describes circumstantially his journeys through England to establish the monthly meetings. This was in 1667: the very year that Barclay joined the society, being then only nineteen years old. Samuel Fisher died two years before this time, after lying in prison a year and a half. See Jos. G. Bevan's *Refutation of some modern misrepresentations of the Society of Friends*, Lond. 1800, 12mo. and the vindication of the Quakers subjoined to this chapter. *Tr.*]

² See Dan. Neal's *History of the Puritans*, iv. 113, 353, 396, 432, 510, 518, 552, 569. Gilb. Burnet's *History of his own Times*, i. 271. Sewel, *l. c. passim*. [The Quakers were conscientious in all these singularities; and though we may consider them as scrupulous, without good reason, and contrary to the example of Christ and his apostles, who paid tribute to the priests,

submitted to civil oaths, and addressed magistrates by their usual titles: yet as they could not think so, they ought to have been indulged. The fact probably was, that many people of that age could not believe that they were actuated merely by scruples of conscience: and others, who did suppose this might be the case, were not disposed to indulge the consciences of those who erred. *Tr.* — There might be nothing very unreasonable in excusing a few strict religionists for withholding customary formalities, or even declining oaths, but *indulgence* in keeping other men out of their livings is entirely a different question. To say nothing of the hardships to which Quakers might reduce the individuals whose tithes they refused to pay, it is obvious that an escape from such payments would have acted as a bounty upon the spread of Quakerism, or upon the rise of other bodies professing scruples of the same profitable character. What would have been said by Quaker creditors, if their debtors had pleaded conscientious objections to pay them? Would they not themselves, at least, have pronounced it unfair to deal with parties whom it was thought unlawful to pay? Upon this estimate of unfairness, it was the bounden duty of Quakers to hire no land as farmers which was not tithe-free. Perhaps a feeling of this kind has operated to make Quakers more generally tradesmen than farmers. There have, however, always been some of them following agriculture, and they generally, perhaps universally, continue to keep up the form of refusing tithe-payments, with some other exactions. This gives the trouble of getting distress-warrants, which are regularly expected, and as regularly provided for, by setting out certain things to be seized, and the seizures are as regularly reported in due form, as the sufferings which the parties have undergone. All this, however, is mere child's play, and it is no wonder, that, as enlightenment extends, more and more people become ashamed of it. English Quakerism, in fact, is rapidly on the decline. The fervid fanaticism which once gained it admiration, has evaporated; and many of those who were, or are, connected with it, having become wealthy, have imbibed the

Under *James II.*, and especially after the year 1685, they began to see better days; for which they were indebted to the celebrated *William Penn*, who was employed by the king in state affairs of the greatest importance.¹ At length *William III.*, who gave peace to all sects of dissenters from the reigning church, allowed these people also to enjoy public liberty and tranquillity.²

§ 4. Oppressed and persecuted in their own country, the Quakers sought to propagate their sentiments among foreign nations, and to establish for themselves more secure habitations. Attempts were made in Germany, Prussia, France, Italy, Greece, Holland, and Holstein; but generally without effect. Yet the Dutch at length were prevailed upon to allow some families the liberty of residing among them, which they enjoy to the present time. Many of these people, not long after the sect arose, proceeded to America. And afterwards, by a singular turn of things, the seat of its liberties and fortunes was established, as it were, in that quarter of the world. *William Penn*, the son of the English vice-admiral, adopted the Quaker religion in 1668; and in the year 1680, *Charles II.* and the parliament granted to him an extensive province in America, at that time a wilderness, in reward for the great services rendered by his father to the nation. *Penn*, who was a man of discernment and also eloquent, conducted a colony of his friends and associates into his new dominions, and there established a republic, in form, laws, and regulations, unlike any other in the known world, yet a peaceful and happy one, and which still flourishes in great prosperity.³ The Quakers there are predominant; yet all persons may become citizens, who acknowledge that there is a Supreme Being whose providence is over all human affairs, and who pay Him homage, if not by outward signs, yet by uprightness of life and conduct. The province was named, from its proprietor, *Pennsylvania*; and the principal city is called *Philadelphia*.

§ 5. While *Fox* was still alive, there were frequent dissensions and broils among the Quakers (in the years 1656, 1661, 1683, and other years), not indeed respecting religion itself, but respecting discipline, customs, and things of minor consequence. But these contests, for the most part, were soon adjusted.⁴ After the death of *Fox* (which occurred in 1691), among others, *George Keith* especially, the most learned man of the whole sect, gave occasion to greater commotions. For *Keith* was thought, by the other brethren in *Pennsylvania*, to entertain sentiments not accordant with the truth on several points, but especially in regard to the human nature of Christ. He main-

enlarged ideas of the wealthier classes generally, and wish to pass undistinguished among them. S.]

¹ See Sewel's *History of the Quakers*, p. 538, 546, 552, 564, 591, 605, &c.

² *Œuvres de M. de Voltaire*, iv. 182.

³ The charter, the laws, and other papers relating to the establishment of this new commonwealth, were published [in Rapin's

History, *Penn's Works*], and not long since in the *Bibliothèque Britannique*, t. xv. pt. ii. p. 310, t. xvi. pt. i. p. 127. Penn himself acquired a high reputation by several productions of his pen and by other things. Sewel treats of him in places; and Burnet also, in his *History of his own Times*.

⁴ See Sewel's *History of the Quakers*, p. 126, 132, 262, 429, 529, &c.

tained that our Saviour possessed a twofold human nature, the one celestial and spiritual, the other terrene and corporeal.¹ This and the other inventions of *Keith* would, perhaps, have been borne with great moderation, by a people who place all religion in an indescribable sense or instinct, if he had not strongly reprov'd some strange opinions of the American brethren; and in particular, had he not opposed their turning the whole history of our Saviour into an allegory, or a symbolical representation of the duties that religion requires of man. In Europe, indeed, the Quakers dare not deny the truth of the history of Jesus Christ; but in America, where they have nothing to fear, they are said to utter what they think, and to deny any *Christ* who exists without us. This controversy between *Keith* and the other Quakers, which was discussed in several general meetings of the whole sect in England, and even brought before the British parliament, was at last decided in the year 1695, by the exclusion of *Keith* and his adherents from communion in worship. Touched with a sense of injury, after some years, *Keith* returned to the English church.²

¹ *Cérémonies et Coutumes de tous les Peuples du Monde*, iv. 141, &c. Gerh. Croesius, *Historia Quakeriana*, l. iii. p. 446, &c.

² Gilb. Burnet's *History of his own Times*, ii. 290. The commotions about *Keith* are treated of by William Sewel, *History of the Quakers*, p. 577, 592, 603. But either he did not understand the true nature of the controversy (which might be, as he was not a man of learning), or he designedly perverts and obscures it. More light is thrown on it in the German *Life of Henry Bernh. Küster*, published in Rahtlef's *Gelehrte Europa*, iii. 484. For Küster, a man of probity, then lived in America, and was an eye-witness of the transactions. [Mosheim appears to have been misinformed respecting George Keith and his controversy with the American Quakers; and therefore, with many others, he has given us Keith's false and slanderous representations as being a true account.—Keith was a Scotchman, born and liberally educated in the Scotch church. How and when he became a Quaker is not known. But for more than five-and-twenty years he travelled, preached, wrote, and suffered among the Quakers of England and Scotland. During this period he was one of their most learned and efficient ministers, and was held by them in high estimation. In 1689 he removed to America, and settled in Philadelphia, where he was made master of the principal school among the Quakers. He now attempted to direct and reform the discipline of the society, and to assume a dictation which was offensive to his brethren. Mutual alienation took place; and Keith dealt out his censures both of men and measures with great freedom. A party adhered to him;

but the great body of Quakers, whom he was continually assailing, thought proper to lay him under censure in 1692. Keith and his party still professed to be in communion with the English Quakers; but when the yearly meeting of Philadelphia sent an account of his case to the yearly meeting of London, in the spring of 1694, Keith thought proper to appear there, in vindication of his conduct. He asked and obtained a hearing; and the yearly meeting of London, after a full examination of the case, approved entirely of the proceedings of the American Quakers, and excluded Keith from all fellowship, *for his factious and unchristian conduct, and his false criminations of the American brethren*. A few, however, adhered to him in England, and he set up a separate meeting in London, and laboured much during several years to destroy that faith which he had spent so many years in defending and propagating. His misrepresentations of the views of the Quakers were abundant; and they were answered and confuted with no little success from his own former publications. Meeting with but little success in forming a new party, and gradually departing further and further from Quaker principles, he in 1700 wholly renounced Quakerism, and became an episcopal clergyman. In this capacity he visited America in 1702, hoping to draw many Quakers into the English Church. But his former partisans in America, though not yet reconciled with the Quakers, would not follow him into the established church. Being entirely unsuccessful in America, Keith returned to England, became a parish minister, and died a few years after. See Gough's *Hist. of the Quakers*, iii. 317—350, 382—390, 442—455. Sewel's *Hist. of the*

His friends long held their separate meetings; but, if report may be credited, have now become reconciled with the brethren.¹

§ 6. The religion of the Quakers appears at first view to be a novel thing; but it is not so in fact. For it is the ancient *mystic theology* which arose in the second century, was fostered by *Origen*, and has been handed down to us by men of various characters and genius; but a little expanded and enlarged by the addition of consequences before not well understood. The well-meaning *Fox*, indeed, did not invent anything; but all that he taught respecting the internal word or light and its power, he undoubtedly derived either from the books of the *mystics*, a multitude of which were then circulating in England, or from the discourses of some persons initiated in the mystic doctrines. But the doctrines which he brought forward confusedly and rudely (for he was a man of uncultivated mind, and not adorned and polished with any literature or science), the sagacity of *Barclay*, *Keith*, *Fisher*, and *Penn* polished, and reduced to such coherency, that they exhibit the appearance of a digested system or body of doctrine. The Quakers, therefore, may be justly pronounced the principal sect of mystics, who have not only embraced the precepts of that arcane wisdom, but have likewise seen whither those precepts lead, and have received also all the consequences that flow from them.²

Quakers, ii. 493—495, 496, &c. 526—534, 574. Tr.]

¹ See William Rogers' *Christian Quaker*, Lond. 1699, 4to, and *The Quakers a divided People*, Lond. 1708, 4to. *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, A.D. 1744, p. 496, &c.

² Most persons think that we are to learn what the Quakers believe and teach from Robert Barclay's Catechism, but especially from his *Apology for the true Christian Divinity*, which was published, Lond. 1676, 4to, and translated into other languages. Nor shall I much object to this opinion, if it be understood to mean that this sect is exceedingly desirous that others should judge of the nature of their religion by these books. But if any would have us believe that these books contain everything the Quakers regard as true, and that nothing more than these contain was formerly taught among them, or is now taught, he may be easily confuted from numerous publications. For Barclay assumed the office of an *advocate*, not that of a teacher; and of course he explains the sentiments of his sect, just as those do who undertake to defend an odious cause. In the first place, he is silent on points of Christianity of the utmost importance, concerning which it is very desirable to know the true sentiments of the Quakers; and he exhibits a really mutilated system of theology. For it is the practice of advocates to pass over the things that cannot easily be placed in an advantageous light, and to take up only such things as

ingenuity and eloquence can make appear plausible and excellent. In the next place, he touches upon several things, the full exposition of which would bring much odium on the Quakers, only cursorily and slightly; which is also an indication of a bad cause. Lastly, and to go no further, the things which he cannot deny or conceal he explains in the most delicate and cautious manner, in common, ordinary phraseology, not very definite, avoiding carefully all the appropriate and almost consecrated terms adopted by the sect. Now it will not be very difficult for one who will take such a course, to give a specious appearance to any the most absurd doctrines. And it is well known that in this way the doctrine of Spinoza has been disguised and painted up by some of his disciples. There are other writers of this sect who express their sentiments much more clearly and freely; among whom William Penn and George Whitehead, very celebrated men, deserve to be read preferably to all others. Among their other works there is one entitled, *The Christian Quaker and his Divine Testimony vindicated by Scripture, Reason, and Authorities, against the injurious attempts that have been lately made by several adversaries*; Lond. 1674, small folio. Penn wrote the first part, and Whitehead the second. There is also extant, in Sewel's History, p. 578, a *Confession of Faith*, which the Quakers published in 1693, in the midst of the controversy with Keith. But it is very cautiously drawn

§ 7. Their fundamental doctrine, therefore, and that on which all their other doctrines depend, is that very ancient song of the mystic school: That there lurks in the minds of all men, a portion of the divine reason or nature, or a spark of that wisdom which is in God Himself. That whoever is desirous of true happiness and eternal salvation must, by turning his thoughts inward, and away from external objects (or by contemplation and weakening the empire of the senses), draw forth, kindle, and inflame this *hidden, divine spark*, which is oppressed and suffocated by the mass of the body and by the darkness of the flesh, with which our souls are surrounded. That whoever shall do so will find a wonderful light rise upon him, or a celestial voice break upon him out of the inmost recesses of his soul, which will instruct him in all divine truth, and be the surest pledge of union with the supreme God. This natural treasure of mankind is called by various names; very often by that of a *divine light*; sometimes, a *ray of eternal wisdom*; sometimes, *celestial sophia*; concerning whose nuptials, under a female garb, with man, some of this class of people speak in magnificent terms. The terms best known among us are, *the internal Word*, and *Christ within us*. For, as they hold the sentiment of the ancient mystics and of *Origen*, that *Christ* is the *reason* and *wisdom* of God, and suppose all men to be furnished with a particle of the divine wisdom, they are obliged to maintain that *Christ*, or the *Word of God*, resides, acts, and speaks in all persons.¹

§ 8. Whatever other singular and strange sentiments they may

up, and a great part of it ambiguous. [Dr. Toulmin thinks that Mosheim is here uncandid and unjust towards Barclay; and that he has exposed himself to the just animadversions of Gough, in his *History of the Quakers*, ii. 401—406. See Toulmin's note to Neal, v. 253, ed. Boston, 1817. Not having Barclay's Apology before me, I will pass no judgment on the justice or injustice of Mosheim's statements. But I will say, that I do not understand him to charge Barclay with direct and wilful misrepresentations; but only with so far acting the *advocate*, that his book is not the best guide to a full and correct knowledge of the sentiments of the Quakers: and consequently, that it is necessary to consult other works, such as the writings of Penn and Whitehead, if we would fully and truly understand the Quaker system. Now this may be so, while still the *Vindication of the Quakers by the Committee representing the yearly meeting of Friends in Philadelphia, A.D. 1799*, may very honestly and truly say, 'As to our tenets and history, we refer to Fox, Barclay, Penn, Sewel, Gough, &c., and declare that we never had, nor now have, any other doctrines to publish, and that there are no religious opinions or practices among us which have not been made known to the world.' *Tr.*]

¹ Yet the modern Quakers, as appears from the writings of Josiah Martin and others, are ignorant of the true sentiments of their forefathers, and perpetually confound this inherent and innate light with that light of the Holy Spirit which is shed on the minds of the pious. [This declaration of Mosheim clearly shows that he did not understand the fundamental principle of the Quakers, which is essentially different from that of the ancient mystics. The *particle of the divine nature*, which the mystics supposed to be a constituent part of man, at his first creation, or a *natural principle* in all men, and which was sufficient to enlighten, guide, and sanctify them, provided the influences of the *body* or of *sense* could be counteracted, was quite a different thing from the *internal light* of the Quakers. For the latter was supposed to be a *revelation* made to the soul by *Christ*, acting through the Holy Spirit. It was therefore *grace*, not *nature*; a divine communication to fallen men, and not an original principle in their natural constitutions: and its influences and operations were moral, not physical. It is therefore not strange, that the Quakers should complain of this and the following sections, as totally misrepresenting their fundamental principles. *Tr.*]

hold, all originated from this one principle, as their prolific source. Because Christ resides in every son of Adam, therefore: I. All religion consists in man's averting his mind from external objects, weakening the empire of the senses, turning himself inward upon himself, and listening with his whole attention to what the Christ in his breast, or the internal light, dictates and enjoins.—II. The external word, that is, holy Scripture, does not enlighten and guide men to salvation; for words and syllables, being lifeless things, cannot have power to illumine the soul of man, and to unite it to God. The only effect of the inspired books, upon one who reads them, is, to excite and stimulate him to attend to the internal word, and to seek the school of Christ teaching within him. Or, to express the same thing in other words, the Bible is a mute guide, which by signs points and directs to the living master residing in the soul.—III. Those who are destitute of this written word, Pagans, Jews, Mahumedans, and the barbarous nations, want, indeed, some aid for obtaining salvation, but not the way or the discipline of salvation itself. For if they would give heed to the internal teacher, who is never silent when the man listens to him, they might abundantly learn from him whatever is necessary to be known and to be done.—IV. The kingdom of Jesus Christ, therefore, is of vast extent, and embraces the whole human race. For all men carry Christ in their souls; and by him, though living in the greatest barbarism, and totally ignorant of the Christian religion, they may become wise and happy, both in this life and in that to come. They who live virtuously, and restrain the cravings of lust, whether they are Jews, Mahumedans, or Pagans, may become united to God through Christ residing in their souls, in this world, and be united to him for ever.—V. The principal reason why men do not perceive and hear Christ present within them, is the heavy, dark body, composed of vicious matter, with which they are enveloped. And hence all possible care must be taken, that this connexion of soul and body do not blunt the mind, disturb its operations, and by means of the senses fill it with images of external things. And on this account, it is not to be supposed, that when the souls of men shall have escaped this prison, God will again thrust them into it; but what the Scriptures tell us of the resurrection of our bodies, must either be understood figuratively, or be referred to new and celestial bodies.¹

¹ These propositions all Quakers admit, or at least, *ought* to admit, if they would not entirely depart from the first principles of their system. The doctrines concerning which they disagree and dispute among themselves, we here pass over, lest we should appear disposed to render the sect odious. [It is so far from being true, that 'all Quakers admit these propositions,' that they declare them to be mere fictions of Mosheim, or consequences which he, and not they, deduce from their first principle. And, indeed, they seem to be a philosophical

creed, essentially diverse from the true belief of the Quakers. See the preceding note. According to the belief of the Quakers, the conflicting principles in sinful men are not a *particle of the divine nature* opposed and weighed down by the *material body*; but are, *divine grace*, or the gracious operations of the Holy Spirit, conflicting with the corrupt *nature of fallen men*. This *divine grace*, they hold, indeed, as the Arminians also do, to be universal, or to be afforded to all mankind as soon as they become moral agents. They likewise be-

§ 9. These things show that the religion of the Quakers can conveniently dispense with a *Christ without*; and with all that Christians believe, from the holy Scriptures, concerning his divine origin, life, merits, sufferings, and atonement, because the whole ground of salvation lies in the *Christ within*. Not a few of them, therefore, as we learn from very credible authors, once fell into the absurdity of maintaining that the whole Scripture narrative respecting Jesus Christ, is not the history of the Son of God, clothed in human nature, but the history of Christ within us, decorated with poetic imagery and allegory. This opinion, if we may give credit to very respectable witnesses, is so far from having become extinct among them, that on the contrary it still prevails and is taught in America. But the Europeans, either from the force of truth, or compelled by fear, maintain, that the divine *wisdom* or *reason* descended into the son of the Virgin *Mary*, and by him instructed mankind; and that this divine man actually did and suffered what he is recorded to have done and suffered. At the same time, they express themselves very ambiguously respecting many things pertaining to Christ: in particular, respecting the fruits of his sufferings and death, their statements are so loose and meagre, that it is altogether uncertain and dubious, what and how great they suppose these fruits to be. Besides, they have not renounced wholly the [figurative] interpretation of the history of Christ, above mentioned; for they press us hard to grant that the things which occurred in regard to our Saviour, while resident among men, are signs and emblems of the things which may occur, and must occur, in relation to the Christ within, in order that man may partake of salvation. And hence they are accustomed, with the mystics their preceptors, to talk much, in lofty terms and inflated style, of *Christ's* being born, living, dying, and rising to life, in the hearts of saints.¹

lieve, with the Arminians, that the teachings and influences of this grace are sufficient, if duly improved, to lead those, who have not the Scriptures, to holiness and to salvation. Neither is it true that they deny the resurrection of the body; though they seem to have an idea, that the future spiritual body will so differ from the present body, that it cannot be called the *same*. Thus Henry Tuke (as quoted in Rees's *Cyclopædia*, article *Quakers*) says: 'The doctrine of the resurrection of the dead is so connected with the Christian religion, that it will be also proper to say something on this subject. In explaining our belief of this doctrine, we refer to the 15th chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. In this chapter (verses 40, 42, 44, 50), is clearly laid down the *resurrection of a body*, though not of the *same body* that dies. Here we rest our belief in this mystery, without desiring to pry into it beyond what is revealed to us.' *Tr.*]

¹ [In answer to most of the allegations

in this section, the Quakers refer us, triumphantly, to the following extracts from their declaration or Confession of faith, drawn up in 1693, and preserved by Sewel, *Hist. of the Quakers*, ii. 497, &c. 'We sincerely profess faith in God, by his only-begotten Son, Jesus Christ, as being our only *light* and *life*, our *only way* to the Father, and our *only Mediator* and *Advocate* with the Father:—That God created all things, and made the worlds, by his son, Jesus Christ; he being that powerful and living *Word* of God, by whom all things were made; and that the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, are *One*, in divine Being inseparable; one true, living, and eternal God, blessed for ever:—Yet that this Word or son of God, in the fulness of time, *took flesh*, became *perfect man*, according to the flesh, descended and came of the seed of Abraham and David, but was miraculously conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary; and also further, declared powerfully to be the Son of God, according to the Spirit

§ 10. From the same source which has been mentioned [namely, the ancient mystic theology], have flowed their discipline and practice. They assemble, indeed, on the days in which other Christians generally assemble for religious purposes. But they neither observe festival days, nor use ceremonies and rites, nor suffer religion to be fettered by any positive institutions; placing it wholly in the worship of Christ hidden in the heart. Such as please teach in their assemblies, both men and women: for who may deny to persons, in whom *Christ* dwells and speaks, liberty to address and instruct the brethren? Prayers, hymns, and the other exercises which distinguish the public assemblies of other Christians, are unknown and discarded by them: and not without reason, since they believe with the mystics, that to pray truly, is not to utter the desires of our hearts in a set form of words, but to collect the mind, recall it from all emotion and thought, and fix it wholly on a present Deity. Neither do they baptize new members of their community; nor renew the remembrance of Christ's death, and the benefits of it, in the Lord's Supper. For they suppose both institutions to be Judaical; and to have been formerly used by the Saviour, only to represent to the eye, in visible imagery, by baptism, the mystical purification of the soul, and, by the holy supper, the spiritual nourishment of the soul.

§ 11. The system of morals adopted by them is beyond measure austere and forbidding. It is chiefly comprehended in these two precepts:—I. Whatever can afford us pleasure, produce agreeable emotions, or gratify the senses, must either be wholly avoided, or, if by the laws of nature this is impossible, must be so tempered and checked by reason and reflection, that it may not corrupt the soul.¹ Because, as the mind ought to be always and exclusively attentive to the voice and the intimations of the teacher within, it should be separated from the intercourse and contagion of the body and corporeal things.—II. It is criminal to follow the customs, fashions, and manners, that are generally received in society. Hence they are easily distinguished from other people by their outward deportment and manner of life. They do not salute those whom they meet, never use the customary language of politeness and civility; never show respect to magistrates and to men of rank by any bodily gestures, or the use of honorary titles; never defend their lives, their property, or their reputations, against violence and slander; never take an oath; never seek redress in civil courts, or prosecute those who injure them: on the contrary, they distinguish themselves from all their fellow-citizens, by their

of sanctification, by the resurrection from the dead:—That, *as man, Christ died for our sins*, rose again, and was received up into glory in the heavens; he having, *in his dying for all, been that one, great, universal offering and sacrifice for peace, atonement, and reconciliation, between God and man*; and he is the *propitiation*, not for our sins only, but for the sins of the whole world: We were *reconciled by his death*, but *saved by his life*:—That divine honour and worship is due to the Son of God; and that he is,

in true faith, to be prayed unto, and the name of the Lord Jesus Christ called upon (as the primitive Christians did), because of the glorious union or oneness of the Father and the Son.' *Tr.*]

¹ [The first part of this precept (total avoidance of pleasures), the Quakers themselves say, 'is no tenet of the Quakers.' To the latter part of the precept they make no objection; believing it to be coincident with the apostle James's direction, 'to keep himself unspotted by the world.' *Tr.*]

aspect and demeanour, by their dress, which is very simple and rustic, by their phraseology, their diet, and other outward things. It is, however, affirmed, by persons of credibility, that the Quakers, especially the prosperous Quaker merchants of England, have already departed considerably from these austere rules of life, and are gradually departing further and further; nay, that they explain and shape much more wisely the religious system of their predecessors. It is also well attested, that very many of them have but an imperfect knowledge of the religion transmitted to them by their fathers.

§ 12. This sect, at its commencement, had no organisation and government. But afterwards the leading men perceived that their community could not subsist and escape falling into great disorder, unless it had regulations and men to superintend its affairs. Hence boards of elders were established, who discuss and regulate everything involving doubt and difficulty, and carefully watch that no one conduct himself amiss, or do anything injurious to the society. To these elders people who think of marrying give in their names: to them all births and deaths in the society are reported: to them such as wish publicly to address the people exhibit their discourses, and in some instances, written out, that the elders may see whether they will enlighten and edify.¹ For they do not allow, as they once did, every one at his pleasure to declaim before the people; since the very indiscreet orations of many have brought much reproach and ridicule upon the society. There are also, in the larger congregations, especially in London, certain persons, whose duty it is to exhort the people, if it should so happen that no one of the assembly is disposed to instruct and exhort the brethren; lest, as often happened, for want of an orator the meeting should break up without a word said.² It is not indeed necessary that there should be any speaking in the Quaker assemblies. For the brethren do not come together to listen to an external teacher, but to attend to the voice of that teacher which each one carries in his own breast; or, as they express it, *to commune with themselves*.³ But as these silent meetings afforded occasion to their enemies to rail and deride, they have now appointed fixed speakers, to whom also they give a small compensation for their services.⁴ The Quakers annually hold a general convention of their whole society, at London, the week before Whit-Sunday, in which all their congregations are represented; and by this convention important questions are examined and decided. The Quakers at this day complain of many grievances: but these all originate solely from their refusal to pay tithes.

¹ [This duty of their elders the Quakers deny; declaring that their speakers never write their discourses; and that no such practice as that here described, exists among them. Their speakers, however, have a kind of licence or approbation; or at least, when they travel abroad, they carry some testimonials. And it is well known that they have standing committees to superintend all publications relating to the history and doctrines of the society. *Tr.*]

² [Here again the Quakers, through Mr.

Bevan of London, deny the existence of such subsidiary speakers in their congregation. *Tr.*]

³ [*Ut in semet ipsos introvertant.*] Sewel, *Hist. of the Quakers*, p. 612.

⁴ [Here also Mosheim was misinformed. Mr. Bevan says: 'Except a few clerks of this kind (that is, who keep voluminous records, &c.), and persons who have the care of meeting-houses, none receive any stipend or gratuity for their services in our religious society.' *Tr.*]

SUPPLEMENT

RELATING TO THE DOCTRINES AND DISCIPLINE

OF THE

SOCIETY OF FRIENDS, COMMONLY CALLED QUAKERS.*

CHAPTER I.

DOCTRINE.

General Belief — Universal and saving Light — Worship — Ministry — Women's preaching — Baptism and the Supper — Universal Grace — Perfection — Oaths and War — Government — Deportment — Conclusion.

WE agree with other professors of the Christian name in the belief of one eternal God, the Creator and the Preserver of the universe; and in Jesus Christ his Son, the Messiah, and Mediator of the new covenant.¹

When we speak of the gracious display of the love of God to mankind, in the miraculous conception, birth, life, miracles, death, resurrection, and ascension of our Saviour, we prefer the use of such terms as we find in Scripture; and, contented with that knowledge which Divine Wisdom hath seen meet to reveal, we attempt not to explain those mysteries which remain under the veil; nevertheless, we acknowledge and assert the divinity of Christ, who is the wisdom and power of God unto salvation.²

To Christ alone we give the title of the Word of God,³ and not to the Scriptures; although we highly esteem these sacred writings, in

* [Mosheim's account of the Quakers is so very faulty, that the American editions of the work have generally been accompanied with other statements, derived from other and better authorities. In the preceding notes many of the mistakes of Mosheim have been pointed out. But still it is believed, that full justice will not be done to the principles of this sect, without allowing them to express their religious views in their own language. The following Supplement is therefore annexed, being part of

a 'Summary of the History, Doctrine, and Discipline of Friends, written at the desire of the Yearly Meeting for sufferings in London;' first published in a small work by Joseph Gurney Bevan, Lond. 1800, 12mo, and afterwards annexed to the 4th vol. of Maclaine's *Mosheim*, ed. New York, 1824. *Tr.*]

¹ Heb. xii. 24.

² 1 Cor. i. 24.

³ John i. 1.

subordination to the Spirit,¹ from which they were given forth; and we hold, with the apostle Paul, that they are able to make wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus.²

We reverence those most excellent precepts which are recorded in Scripture to have been delivered by our great Lord, and we firmly believe that they are practicable, and binding on every Christian; and that in the life to come every man will be rewarded according to his works.³ And, further, it is our belief, that, in order to enable mankind to put in practice these sacred precepts, many of which are contradictory to the unregenerate will of man,⁴ every man coming into the world is endued with a measure of light, grace, or good Spirit of Christ, by which, as it is attended to, he is enabled to distinguish good from evil, and to correct the disorderly passions and corrupt propensities of his nature, which mere reason is altogether insufficient to overcome. For all that belongs to man is fallible, and within the reach of temptation; but this divine grace, which comes by Him who hath overcome the world,⁵ is, to those who humbly and sincerely seek it, an all-sufficient and present help in time of need. By this the snares of the enemy are detected, his allurements avoided, and deliverance is experienced through faith in its effectual operation: whereby the soul is translated out of the kingdom of darkness, and from under the power of Satan, into the marvellous light and kingdom of the Son of God.

Being thus persuaded that man, without the Spirit of Christ inwardly revealed, can do nothing to the glory of God, or to effect his own salvation, we think this influence especially necessary to the performance of the highest act of which the human mind is capable; even the worship of the Father of lights and of spirits in spirit and in truth: therefore we consider as obstructions to pure worship all forms which divert the attention of the mind from the secret influence of this unction from the Holy One.⁶ Yet, although true worship is not confined to time and place, we think it incumbent on Christians to meet often together,⁷ in testimony of their dependence on the Heavenly Father, and for a renewal of their spiritual strength: nevertheless, in the performance of worship, we dare not depend for our acceptance with Him, on a formal repetition of the words and experiences of others; but we believe it to be our duty to lay aside the activity of the imagination, and to wait in silence to have a true sight of our condition bestowed upon us; believing even a single sigh,⁸ arising from such a sense of our infirmities, and the need we have of divine help, to be more acceptable to God than any performances, however specious, which originate in the will of man.

From what has been said respecting worship, it follows that the ministry which we approve must have its origin from the same source:

¹ 2 Pet. i. 21.

² 2 Tim. iii. 15.

³ Matt. xvi. 27.

⁴ John i. 9.

⁵ John xvi. 33.

⁶ 1 John ii. 20, 27.

⁷ Heb. x. 25.

⁸ Rom. viii. 26.

for that which is needful for man's own direction, and for his acceptance with God,¹ must be eminently so to enable him to be helpful to others. Accordingly, we believe that the renewed assistance of the light and power of Christ is indispensably necessary for all true ministry; and that this holy influence is not at our command, or to be procured by study, but is the free gift of God to chosen and devoted servants. Hence arises our testimony against preaching for hire, in contradiction to Christ's positive command, 'Freely ye have received, freely give';² and hence our conscientious refusal to support such ministry by tithes or other means.

As we dare not encourage any ministry but that which we believe to spring from the influence of the Holy Spirit, so neither dare we attempt to restrain this influence to persons of any condition in life, or to the male sex alone; but, as male and female are one in Christ, we allow such of the female sex as we believe to be endued with a right qualification for the ministry to exercise their gifts for the general edification of the church: and this liberty we esteem a peculiar mark of the gospel dispensation, as foretold by the prophet Joel,³ and noticed by the apostle Peter.⁴

There are two ceremonies in use among most professors of the Christian name, Water-baptism, and what is termed the Lord's Supper. The first of these is generally esteemed the essential means of initiation into the church of Christ; and the latter of maintaining communion with Him. But as we have been convinced that nothing short of his redeeming power, inwardly revealed, can set the soul free from the thralldom of sin, by this power alone we believe salvation to be effected. We hold that as there is one Lord and one faith,⁵ so his baptism is one in nature and operation; that nothing short of it can make us living members of his mystical body; and that the baptism with water, administered by his forerunner John, belonged, as the latter confessed, to an inferior and decreasing dispensation.⁶

With respect to the other rite, we believe that communion between Christ and his church is not maintained by that nor any other external performance, but only by a real participation of his divine nature⁷ through faith; that this is the supper alluded to in the Revelation,⁸ 'Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me;' and that where the substance is attained, it is unnecessary to attend to the shadow; which doth not confer grace, and concerning which opinions so different, and animosities so violent, have arisen.

Now, as we thus believe that the grace of God, which comes by Jesus Christ, is alone sufficient for salvation, we can neither admit that it is conferred on a few only, whilst others are left without it:

¹ Jer. xxiii. 30—32.

² Matt. x. 8.

³ Joel ii. 28, 29.

⁴ Acts ii. 16, 17.

⁵ Eph. iv. 5.

⁶ John iii. 30.

⁷ 2 Pet. i. 4.

⁸ Rev. viii. 20.

nor, thus asserting its universality, can we limit its operation to a partial cleansing of the soul from sin, even in this life. We entertain worthier notions both of the power and goodness of our heavenly Father, and believe that He doth vouchsafe to assist the obedient to experience a total surrender of the natural will to the guidance of his pure unerring Spirit; through whose renewed assistance they are enabled to bring forth fruits unto holiness, and to stand perfect in their present rank.¹

There are not many of our tenets more generally known than our testimony against oaths and against war. With respect to the former of these, we abide literally by Christ's positive injunction, delivered in his sermon on the mount, 'Swear not at all.'² From the same sacred collection of the most excellent precepts of moral and religious duty, from the example of our Lord Himself,³ and from the correspondent convictions of his Spirit in our hearts, we are confirmed in the belief that wars and fightings are, in their origin and effects, utterly repugnant to the Gospel, which still breathes peace and goodwill to men. We also are clearly of the judgment, that if the benevolence of the Gospel were generally prevalent in the minds of men, it would effectually prevent them from oppressing, much more enslaving, their brethren (of whatever colour or complexion), for whom, as for themselves, Christ died; and would even influence their conduct in their treatment of the brute creation: which would no longer groan, the victims of their avarice, or of their false ideas of pleasure.

Some of our tenets have in former times, as hath been shown, subjected our Friends to much suffering from government, though to the salutary purposes of government our principles are a security. They inculcate submission to the laws in all cases wherein conscience is not violated. But we hold that as Christ's kingdom is not of this world, it is not the business of the civil magistrate to interfere in matters of religion; but to maintain the external peace and good order of the community. We therefore think persecution, even in the smallest degree, unwarrantable. We are careful in requiring our members not to be concerned in illicit trade, nor in any manner to defraud the revenue.

It is well known that the society, from its first appearance, has disused those names of the months and days, which, having been given in honour of the heroes or false gods of the heathen, originated in their flattery or superstition; and the custom of speaking to a single person in the plural number, as having arisen also from motives of adulation. Compliments, superfluity of apparel and furniture, outward shows of rejoicing and mourning, and the observation of days and times, we esteem to be incompatible with the simplicity and sincerity of a Christian life; and public diversions, gaming, and other vain amusements of the world, we cannot but condemn. They are a

¹ Matt. v. 48. Eph. iv. 13. Col. iv. 12.³ Matt. v. 39, 44, &c. xxvi. 52, 53.² Matt. v. 34.

Luke xxii. 51. John xviii. 11.

waste of that time which is given us for nobler purposes; and divert the attention of the mind from the sober duties of life, and from the reproofs of instruction, by which we are guided to an everlasting inheritance.

To conclude, although we have exhibited the several tenets which distinguish our religious society, as objects of our belief, yet we are sensible that a true and living faith is not produced in the mind of man by his own effort, but is the free gift of God¹ in Christ Jesus, nourished and increased by the progressive operation of his Spirit in our hearts, and our proportionate obedience.² Therefore, although for the preservation of the testimonies given us to bear, and for the peace and good order of the society, we deem it necessary that those who are admitted into membership with us, should be previously convinced of those doctrines which we esteem essential, yet we require no formal subscription to any articles, either as a condition of membership, or a qualification for the service of the church. We prefer the judging of men by their fruits, and depending on the aid of Him, who, by his prophet, hath promised to be ‘a spirit of judgment to him that sitteth in judgment.’³ Without this, there is a danger of receiving numbers into outward communion, without any addition to that spiritual sheepfold, whereof our blessed Lord declared Himself to be both the door and the shepherd;⁴ that is, such as know his voice, and follow him in the paths of obedience.

CHAPTER II.

DISCIPLINE.

Its purposes — Meetings for Discipline — MONTHLY MEETINGS — Poor — Convinced Persons — Certificates of Removal — Overseers — Mode of dealing with offenders — Arbitration — Marriages — Births and Burials — QUARTERLY MEETINGS — Queries — Appeals — THE YEARLY MEETING — Women’s Meetings — Meetings of Ministers and Elders — Certificates to Ministers — THE MEETING FOR SUFFERINGS — Conclusion.

THE purposes which our discipline hath chiefly in view are, the relief of the poor,—the maintenance of good order,—the support of the testimonies which we believe it is our duty to bear to the world,—and the help and recovery of such as are overtaken in faults.

In the practice of discipline we think it indispensable that the order recommended by Christ Himself be invariably observed:⁵ ‘If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained

¹ Eph. ii. 8.

² John vii. 17.

³ Isaiah xxviii. 6.

⁴ John x. 7, 11.

⁵ Matt. xviii. 15—17.

thy brother; but if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses, every word may be established: and if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church.'

To effect the salutary purposes of discipline, meetings were appointed at an early period of the society, which, from the times of their being held, were called Quarterly-meetings. It was afterwards found expedient¹ to divide the districts of those meetings, and to meet more frequently; from whence arose Monthly-meetings, subordinate to those held quarterly. At length, in 1669,² a Yearly-meeting was established, to superintend, assist, and provide rules for the whole, previously to which general meetings had been occasionally held.

A Monthly-meeting is usually composed of several particular congregations,³ situated within a convenient distance from each other. Its business is to provide for the subsistence of the poor, and for the education of their offspring; to judge of the sincerity and fitness of persons appearing to be convinced of the religious principles of the society, and desiring to be admitted into membership;⁴ to excite due attention to the discharge of religious and moral duty; and to deal with disorderly members. Monthly-meetings also grant to such of their members as remove into other Monthly-meetings certificates of their membership and conduct; without which they cannot gain membership in such meetings. Each Monthly-meeting is required to appoint certain persons, under the name of overseers, who are to take care that the rules of our discipline be put in practice; and when any case of complaint or disorderly conduct comes to their knowledge, to see that private admonition, agreeably to the Gospel rule before mentioned, be given, previously to its being laid before the Monthly-meeting.

When a case is introduced, it is usual for a small committee to be appointed, to visit the offender, to endeavour to convince him of his error, and to induce him to forsake and condemn it.⁵ If they succeed, the person is by minute declared to have made satisfaction for the offence; if not, he is disowned as a member of the society.⁶

In disputes between individuals, it has long been the decided judgment of the society, that its members should not sue each other at law. It therefore enjoins all to end their differences by speedy

¹ Sewel, 485.

² Fox, 390.

³ Where this is the case, it is usual for the members of each congregation to form what is called a preparative meeting, because its business is to prepare whatever may occur among themselves, to be laid before the Monthly-meeting.

⁴ On application of this kind, a small committee is appointed to visit the party and report to the Monthly-meeting; which is directed by our rules not to admit any into membership without allowing a reason-

able time to consider their conduct.

⁵ This is generally done by a written acknowledgment signed by the offender.

⁶ This is done by what is termed a testimony of denial: which is a paper reciting the offence, and sometimes the steps which have led to it; next the means unavailingly used to reclaim the offender; after that, a clause disowning him; to which is usually added an expression of desire for his repentance, and for his being restored to membership.

and impartial arbitration, agreeably to rules laid down. If any refuse to adopt this mode, or, having adopted it, to submit to the award, it is the direction of the Yearly-meeting that such be disowned.

To Monthly-meetings also belongs the allowing of marriages; for our society hath always scrupled to acknowledge the exclusive authority of the priests in the solemnisation of marriage. Those who intend to marry appear together, and propose their intention to the Monthly-meetings; and if not attended by their parents and guardians, produce a written certificate of their consent, signed in the presence of witnesses. The meeting then appoints a committee to inquire whether they be clear of other engagements respecting marriage; and if at a subsequent meeting, to which the parties also come and declare the continuance of their intention, no objections be reported, they have the meeting's consent to solemnise their intended marriage. This is done in a public meeting for worship, toward the close whereof the parties stand up, and solemnly take each other for husband and wife. A certificate of the proceedings is then publicly read, and signed by the parties, and afterward by the relations and others as witnesses. Of such marriage the Monthly-meeting keeps a record; as also of the births and burials of its members. A certificate of the date, of the name of the infant, and of its parents, signed by those present at the birth, is the subject of one of these last-mentioned records: and an order for the interment, countersigned by the grave-maker, of the other. The naming of children is without ceremony. Burials are also conducted in a simple manner. The body, followed by the relations and friends, is sometimes, previously to interment, carried to a meeting; and at the grave a pause is generally made; on both which occasions it frequently falls out, that one or more Friends present have somewhat to express for the edification of those who attend; but no religious rite is considered as an essential part of burial.

Several Monthly-meetings compose a Quarterly-meeting. At the Quarterly-meeting are produced written answers from the Monthly-meetings, to certain queries respecting the conduct of their members, and the meetings' care over them. The accounts thus received are digested into one, which is sent also, in the form of answers to queries by representatives, to the Yearly-meeting. Appeals from the judgment of Monthly-meetings are brought to the Quarterly-meetings; whose business also is to assist in any difficult case, or where remissness appears in the care of the Monthly-meetings over the individuals who compose them.

The Yearly-meeting has the general superintendence of the society in the country in which it is established;¹ and therefore, as the accounts which it receives discover the state of inferior meetings, as particular exigencies require, or as the meeting is impressed with a sense of duty, it gives forth its advice, makes such regulations as appear to be requisite, or excites to the observance of those already made;

¹ There are seven Yearly-meetings, viz. 1, London, to which come representatives from Ireland; 2, New England; 3, New York; 4, Pennsylvania and New Jersey; 5, Maryland; 6, Virginia; 7, the Carolinas and Georgia.

and sometimes appoints committees to visit those Quarterly-meetings which appear to be in need of immediate advice. Appeals from the judgment of Quarterly-meetings are here finally determined; and a brotherly correspondence, by epistles, is maintained with other Yearly-meetings.¹

In this place it is proper to add, that as we believe that women may be rightly called to the work of the ministry, we also think that to them belongs a share in the support of our Christian discipline; and that some parts of it, wherein their own sex is concerned, devolve on them with peculiar propriety; accordingly they have Monthly, Quarterly, and Yearly meetings of their own sex, held at the same time and in the same place with those of the men; but separately, and without the power of making rules: and it may be remarked that during the persecutions, which in the last century occasioned the imprisonment of so many of the men, the care of the poor often fell on the women, and was by them satisfactorily administered.

In order that those who are in the situation of ministers may have the tender sympathy and counsel of those of either sex,² who, by their experience in the work of religion, are qualified for that service, the Monthly-meetings are advised to select such under the denomination of Elders. These, and ministers approved by their Monthly-meetings,³ have meetings peculiar to themselves, called Meetings of Ministers and Elders; in which they have an opportunity of exciting each other to a discharge of their several duties, and of extending advice to those who may appear to be weak, without any needless exposure. Such meetings are generally held in the compass of each Monthly, Quarterly, and Yearly-meeting. They are conducted by rules prescribed by the Yearly-meeting, and have no authority to make any alteration or addition to them. The members of them unite with their brethren in the meetings for discipline, and are equally accountable to the latter for their conduct.

It is to a meeting of this kind in London, called the Second day's Morning-meeting, that the revisal of manuscripts concerning our principles, previously to publication, is intrusted by the Yearly-meeting held in London: and also the granting, in the intervals of the Yearly-meeting, of certificates of approbation to such ministers as are concerned to travel in the work of the ministry in foreign parts; in addition to those granted by their Monthly and Quarterly meetings. When a visit of this kind doth not extend beyond Great Britain, a certificate from the Monthly-meeting of which the minister is a member is sufficient; if to Ireland, the concurrence of the Quarterly-meeting is also required. Regulations of similar tendency obtain in other Yearly-meetings.

¹ See the last note.

² Fox, 461, 492.

³ Those who believe themselves required to speak in meetings for worship are not immediately acknowledged as ministers by their Monthly-meetings; but time is taken for judgment, that the meeting may be

satisfied of their call and qualification. It will also sometimes happen, that such as are not approved will obtrude themselves as ministers to the grief of their brethren; but much forbearance is used towards these, before the disapprobation of the meeting is publicly testified.

The Yearly-meeting of London, in the year 1675, appointed a meeting to be held in that city, for the purpose of advising and assisting in cases of suffering for conscience' sake, which hath continued with great use to the society to this day. It is composed of Friends under the name of correspondents, chosen by the several Quarterly-meetings, and who reside in or near the city. The same meetings also appoint members of their own in the country as correspondents, who are to join their brethren in London on emergency. The names of all these correspondents, previously to their being recorded as such, are submitted to the approbation of the Yearly-meeting. Those of the men who are approved ministers are also members of this meeting, which is called the Meeting for Sufferings; a name arising from its original purpose, which is not yet become entirely obsolete.

The Yearly-meeting has intrusted the Meeting for Sufferings with the care of printing and distributing books, and with the management of its stock;¹ and, considered as a standing committee of the Yearly-meeting, it hath a general care of whatever may arise, during the intervals of that meeting, affecting the society, and requiring immediate attention; particularly of those circumstances which may occasion an application to Government.

There is not in any of the meetings which have been mentioned any president, as we believe that Divine Wisdom alone ought to preside; nor hath any member a right to claim preeminence over the rest. The office of clerk, with a few exceptions, is undertaken voluntarily by some member; as is also the keeping of the records. Where these are very voluminous, and require a house for their deposit (as is the case in London, where the general records of the society in Great Britain are kept), a clerk is hired to have the care of them; but except a few clerks of this kind, and persons who have the care of meeting-houses, none receive any stipend or gratuity for their services in our religious society.

Thus have we given a view of the foundation and establishment of our discipline; by which it will be seen, that it is not (as hath been frequently insinuated) merely the work of modern times; but was the early care and concern of our pious predecessors. We cannot better close this short sketch of it, than by observing, that if the exercise of discipline should in some instances appear to press hard upon those who, neglecting the monitions of divine counsel in their hearts, are also unwilling to be accountable to their brethren; yet, if that great leading and indispensable rule, enjoined by our Lord, be observed by those who undertake to be active in it, 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them,'² it will prevent the censure of the church from falling on anything but that which really obstructs the truth. Discipline will then promote, in an eminent degree, that love of our neighbour which is the mark of

¹ This is an occasional voluntary contribution, expended in printing books, house-rent for clerk, and his wages for keeping records, the passage of ministers who visit

their brethren beyond sea, and some incidental charges.

² Matt. vii. 17.

discipleship, and without which a profession of love to God, and to his cause, is a vain pretence. ‘He,’ said the beloved disciple, ‘that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen? And this commandment have we from him, that he who loveth God, love his brother also.’¹

¹ 1 John iv. 20, 21.

CHAPTER VI.

HISTORY OF THE MENNONITES OR ANABAPTISTS.

§ 1. The adverse and the prosperous circumstances of the Mennonites—§ 2. Union established among them—§ 3. Sects of the Anabaptists—§ 4. External form of the Mennonite church—§ 5. The Uckewallists—§ 6. The Waterlanders—§ 7. The Galenists and Apostoolians.

§ 1. THE Mennonites, after numberless trials and sufferings, at length obtained, in this century, the much desired peace and tranquillity: but they obtained it very slowly, and by degrees. For although they were admitted to the privileges of citizens among the Dutch in the preceding century, yet they could not prevail on the English, the Swiss, and the Germans, either by prayers or arguments, to grant them the same privileges, or to revise the laws in force against them. The enormities of the old Anabaptists were continually floating in the vision of the magistrates; and it did not seem to them possible, that men, who hold that a Christian can never take an oath, without committing great sin, and who think that Christ allows no place in his kingdom for magistrates and civil punishments, could fulfil the duties of good citizens. And hence, not a few examples may be collected from this century, of Anabaptists who were put to death, or suffered other punishments.¹ At the present time, having exhibited numerous proofs of their probity, they live in peace, not only among the Dutch, but also among the English, the Germans, and the Prussians; and support themselves and families, by their honest industry, partly as labouring men and artificers, and partly by merchandise.

§ 2. The more wise among them, readily perceiving that this external peace would not be very firm and durable, unless their intestine contests and their old altercations about unimportant matters were terminated, applied themselves, from time to time, with great care, to appease these discords. Nor have their efforts been without effect. A large part of the Flandrians, the Germans, and the Frieslanders, renounced their contests, in 1630, at Amsterdam, and entered into a union; each retaining, however, some of its peculiar sentiments. Afterwards, in 1649, the Flandrians in particular, and the Germans, between whom there had formerly been very much disagreement, renewed this alliance, and strengthened it with new guarantees.² All

¹ The enactments of the Swiss against the Mennonites, in this century, are stated by Jo. Bapt. Ottius, *Annales Anabapt.* p. 337, &c., and in some other places: and those of 1693, by Jo. Henry Hottinger, *Schweizerische Kirchenhistorie*, i. 1101. And that, in this eighteenth century, they have not been treated more leniently in the canton of Bern, appears from Herm. Schyn's *Historia Mennonitar.* cap. x. p. 289, &c., where may be seen letters of the States-

General of the United Provinces interceding with that canton in their behalf. In the Palatinate they were grievously persecuted in 1694: when the letters of William III., the king of Great Britain, hushed the tempest. See Herman Schyn, *l. c.* 265, &c. Some instances of Anabaptists being put to death in England are mentioned by Gilb. Burnet, *Hist. of his own Times*, vol. i.

² Herman Schyn, *Plenior deductio Historiæ Mennonit.* p. 41, 42.

these Anabaptists went over to the more moderate part of the sect, and softened down and improved the old institutions of *Menno* and his successors.

§ 3. The whole sect of Anabaptists, therefore, forms at the present day two large communities, namely, the *Refined*, that is, the more strict, who are also called the *old Flemings*, or *Flandrians*; and the *Gross*, that is, the more lax and mild, who are also commonly called *Waterlanders*. The reasons of these names have been already given. Each of these communities is subdivided into several minor parties. The *Refined*, in particular, besides embracing the two considerable parties of *Gröningenists*¹ (who are so called, because they hold their stated conventions at Gröningen), and the *Dantzigers*, or *Prussians* (so named because they have adopted the customs and church government of the Prussians), contains a great number of smaller and more obscure parties, which disagree on various subjects, and especially in regard to discipline, customs, and rules of life, and are united in nothing, but in the name and in the common opinions of the early Anabaptists. All these *Refined* Anabaptists are true disciples of *Menno Simonis*; and they retain, though not all with equal strictness, his doctrines respecting the body of Christ, the washing of strangers' feet as Christ enjoined, the excluding from the church and avoiding as pestilential not only sinners, but also those who even slightly deviate from the ancient simplicity and are stained with some appearance of sin.² At the present day some of their congregations are altering by little and little, and slowly approximating to more moderate sentiments and discipline.

§ 4. All the Anabaptists have, first, *Bishops* or *Elders* who uniformly preside in the consistory [or church session], and have the sole power of administering baptism and the Lord's Supper; secondly, *Teachers*, who preach to the congregation; and lastly, *Deacons* and *Deaconesses*. The ministry [or church-session], which governs the church, is composed of these three orders. The more weighty affairs are proposed and discussed in assemblies of the brethren. All ecclesiastical officers are chosen by the suffrages of the brethren; and, except the deacons, are ordained by prayer and the imposition of hands.

§ 5. Among the minor parties of the more strict [the *Refined*] Anabaptists, that from which its founder, *Uke Walles*, a Frieslander, is called the *Uckewallists* or *Ockwallists*, has obtained a celebrity above others. This rustic and very illiterate man not only wished to have the whole ancient and severe discipline of *Menno* retained entire and unaltered, but also taught in the year 1637, in company with *John Leus*, that there is reason to hope for the salvation of *Judas* and the others, who laid violent hands on our Saviour. To give some plausibility and importance to this error, he pretended, that the

¹ [The *Gröningenists* or old Flemings have gradually laid aside their ancient strictness, both in regard to church-discipline, and the practice of rebaptizing. At present, they think and teach, just as in

the general Anabaptist church. This is a note of the Dutch translator of this History. *Tr.*]

² See Simeon Fred. Rues, *Nachrichten von dem Gegenwärtigen Zustande der Mennoniten*; Jena, 1743, 8vo.

period between the birth of our Saviour and the descent of the Holy Ghost, which divides, as it were, the Old Testament from the New, was a time of darkness and ignorance, during which the Jews were destitute of all light and divine assistance: and hence he would infer, that the sins and wickednesses which they committed, during this period, were in a great measure excusable, and could not merit severe punishment from the justice of God. Neither the Mennonites nor the magistrates of Gröningen could endure this idle fancy: the former excommunicated him, and the latter banished him from the city. He removed therefore into the adjacent province of East Friesland; and collected a large number of disciples, whose descendants still remain in the territory of Gröningen, and in Friesland, Lithuania, and Prussia, and hold their meetings apart from the other Mennonites.¹ Whether they still profess that sentiment which brought so much trouble upon their master, does not appear; for they have very little intercourse with other people. But it is certain that they tread, the most faithfully of all, in the steps of *Menno*, their common preceptor, and exhibit, as it were, a living picture of the first age of Mennonitism.² If any one join them from other sects of Christians, they baptize him anew. Their dress is rustic; nay, worse than rustic: for they will tolerate no appearance or shadow of elegance and ornament. Their beard is long; their hair uncombed; their countenance very gloomy; and their houses and furniture only such as absolute necessity demands. Whoever deviates in the least from this austerity, is forthwith excommunicated, and shunned by all as a pest. Overseers of the church, that is, their *bishops*, who are different from their teachers, must be approved by all their congregations. The washing of feet they regard as a divine rite. They can the more easily keep up this discipline, as they carefully provide, that not a breath of science or learning shall contaminate their pious ignorance.

§ 6. The *Gross* or more moderate Anabaptists consist of the Waterlanders, Flandrians, Frisians, and Germans, who entered into the union already mentioned. They are generally called *Waterlanders*. They have forsaken the more rigid and singular opinions of *Menno*

¹ [It is incorrect to represent the followers of Ucke Walles as constituting a particular sect, bearing the name of *Uckewallists* or *Oeckewallists*. He was merely a preacher among the old Flemings. He may have found some individual persons that would profess his doctrines; but there is no evidence before us, that his particular opinions were embraced by any congregation whatever, and much less by the whole party of the old Flemings, or by any considerable part of it. Besides, his doctrines have been unknown among them now for many years. 'I testify (writes one of their teachers) that it is not known to me, that there is now any church or congregation among the Mennonites, either here, in East Friesland, or anywhere else, that has received or pro-

fessed these particular and absurd opinions.' H. Waerma, *Beknopt Ontwerp*, in the Preface, § 24. Emden, 1744, 8vo. So the *Oeckewallists*, as they are called, or the Gröningsians and old Flemings, are no longer particular sects among the Baptists. See also note ¹ of preceding page. This likewise is a note of the Dutch translator of Mosheim. *Tr.*]

² Jo. Bapt. Ottius, *Annales Anabaptist.* p. 266. Herman Schyn, *Plenior Deductio Histor. Mennonit.* p. 43. Joach. Christ. Jehring, *Diss. de Ukonis Walles Vita et Fatis*; in the *Biblioth. Bremensis Theol. Philol.* viii. 113, and the preface to the History of the Mennonites (in German), p. 11, &c., and the appendix to the same, p. 234, &c.

(whom, however, most of them respect and venerate), and have approximated to the customs and opinions of other Christians. They are divided into two communities, the *Frieslanders* and the *Waterlanders*; neither of which has any bishops, but only *Elders* and *Deacons*. Each congregation is independent, and has its consistory, composed of the *Elders* and *Deacons*. But the supreme power belongs to the people; without whose consent no business of great importance is transacted. Their elders are learned men; some of them doctors of physic, and others teachers of philosophy. And they now support a professor at Amsterdam, who teaches both philosophy and theology.

§ 7. One of these communities of *Waterlanders*,¹ in the year 1664, became split into two parties; which still continue, and which bear the names of *Galenists* and *Apostoolians*, from the names of their [first] teachers. *Galenus Abrahams de Haan*, a doctor of physic, and a minister among the Mennonites at Amsterdam, a man whom even his enemies applaud for his eloquence and penetration, taught, in accordance with the views of the Arminians, that the Christian religion was not so much a body of truths to be believed, as of precepts to be obeyed; and he would have admission to the church, and to the title and privileges of brethren, be open to all persons, who merely believed the books of the Old and New Testaments to be divinely inspired, and lived pure and holy lives. He adopted this principle, because he himself entertained different views, from the other Mennonites, respecting the divine nature of Jesus Christ, and the redemption of the human race by his merits and death, and was inclined to the side of the Socinians.² Against him, *Samuel Apostool*, besides others, who was likewise a distinguished minister of the church at Amsterdam, very strenuously defended, not only the sentiments held by most of the Mennonites in common with other Christians, respecting the divinity of our Saviour, and the influences of his death, but also the well-known peculiar sentiment of this sect, respecting the visible church of Christ on earth.³ The consequence of this contest was a schism, which some prudent and influential men still labour in

¹ [This is either a mistake or a slip of the pen in Mosheim. This schism did not occur in the community of the Waterlanders, but in that of the Flemings; and among them only at Amsterdam. The church of the Flemings at Amsterdam, in which were the two preachers Galenus Abrahams de Haan and Samuel Apostool, became at this time divided. Some years afterwards, the Waterlander church in the above-named city united with the Galenists. Such is the note of the Dutch translator of this work. *Tr.*]

² [Galenus Abrahams was accused of this by his opposers. The court of Holland (the States-General) investigated the subject, and acquitted this minister, on the 14th of September, 1663. See Wagenaer, Amsterdam, part ii. p. 195, and 237. Note of the Dutch translator.—To the history of

the Orthodox or Non-Remonstrant Mennonites, belongs, *The Faith of the true Mennonites or Baptists gathered from their public Confessions*, by Cornelius Ris, minister of the Mennonites at Hoorn, with an explanatory *Introduction and Appendix*; Hamburg, 1776, 4to (in German). This is properly a translation of the Dutch original, which was published in 1773. It exhibits many correct views in genuine Christianity, in both its theoretical and practical parts; and is free from the doctrine, which is peculiar only to some of the Mennonites, respecting the origin of Christ's human nature. Note of the Dutch translator. *Tr.*]

³ See, respecting both [these men], Herman Schyn's *Deductio Plenior Historie Mennonit.* cap. xv. p. 318, and cap. xviii. p. 237.

vain to remove. The *Galenists* are equally ready, with the Arminians, to admit all sorts of persons into their church, who call themselves Christians; and they are the only Anabaptists [in Holland] who refuse to be called *Mennonites*. The *Apostoolians* admit none to membership, who do not profess to believe the doctrines contained in the public formula of their religion.¹

¹ Caspar Commelin, *Description of the city of Amsterdam* (in Dutch), i. 500, &c. Stoupa, *La Religion des Hollandois*, p. 20, &c. Henry Lewis Bentheim's *Holländischer Schul- und Kirchen-staat*, pt. i. ch. xix. p. 830. [As this chapter of Mosheim's history embraces only the Dutch Baptists or *Mennonites*, it seems proper to add here a brief narrative of the English Baptists.—Most of the *Anabaptists* mentioned in English history prior to the reign of James I. appear to have been either Dutch and other foreign Anabaptists, who endeavoured to establish themselves in England, or small companies of converts made by them in the country. Yet there were probably many individuals among the people, who questioned, or denied, the propriety of infant baptism; and there are some intimations of attempts by such persons to hold conventicles, in the latter part of the reign of Elizabeth. But the first regular congregation of English Baptists appears to have originated from certain English Puritans, who returned from Holland after the death of their pastor, Rev. John Smith, who died in 1610. See cent. xvi. sect. iii. pt. ii. c. vi. § 23, note. These were *General* or *Arminian Baptists*; and may be supposed to have derived many of their opinions from the Mennonites. From this time onward, churches of General Baptists were formed, here and there, in different parts of England. But, in general, they made no great figure, and do not appear to have had much connexion, or to have professed one uniform faith. The *Particular* or *Calvinistic Baptists* trace their origin to a congregation of *Independents*, established in London in 1616. This congregation having become very large, and some of them differing from the others on the subject of infant baptism, they agreed to divide. Those who disbelieved in infant baptism were regularly dismissed in 1633, and formed into a new church, under Rev. John Spilsbury. In 1638, several more members were dismissed to Mr. Spilsbury's church. And in 1639, a new Baptist church was formed. Churches of Particular Baptists now multiplied rapidly. In 1646, there were forty-six in and about London. They published a confession of their faith in 1643, which was reprinted in 1644, and 1646; and which was revised in 1689 by a convention of elders and delegates from more than one hundred churches in England

and Wales. Besides these, there were at that time several churches of Calvinistic Baptists, who held to open communion, especially in Bedfordshire, where John Bunyan preached. There were also some *Seventh-day Baptists*. Baptist churches were also planted in Ireland, in the times of the civil wars; and Roger Williams established a Baptist church in Providence in 1639, which was the commencement of this denomination in America.—When Cromwell had usurped the government, he dismissed the principal officers of the army, alleging, among other reasons, that they were all Anabaptists. Yet, during his administration, they had full toleration; indeed his *Tryers* admitted a number of their preachers to become parish ministers of England. On the restoration of Charles II. in 1660, the Baptists, with all other Nonconformists, were exposed to great troubles and persecutions; and at the revolution in 1688, they, with the other Dissenters, obtained free toleration. Among the English Baptists of this century, there were some men of education; but the greater part of their preachers were not men of learning. The Particular Baptists, at their general convention in 1689, made arrangements for the better education of young men for their pulpits; and from their provisions originated afterwards the famous Baptist Academy at Bristol. Before the erection of regular Baptist congregations, and indeed for some time after, it was very common for Baptists and others to belong to the same church, and to worship and commune together. From their first rise, the Baptists were assailed for holding only to adult baptism, and that by immersion; and they were not backward to defend themselves. The severest conflict of the Particular Baptists was with the Quakers, in the time of William Penn. One of their writers made statements, for which the Quakers accused him of falsehood; which caused violent animosities, and much mutual crimination. The Particular Baptists had also controversies among themselves. One was, respecting their practice of *confirmation*, or imposing hands on those newly baptized. Another related to the propriety of admitting *singing*, as a part of their public worship.—The *Particular Baptists* scarcely differed at all from the *Independents*, except on the mode and subjects of baptism. The

General Baptists, having no bond of union among themselves, held a considerable diversity of opinions; and as they did not set forth full and explicit accounts of their faith, it is impossible to characterise them, otherwise than by saying, they in general laid little stress on doctrines, and allowed very great liberty of opinion.—See

Crosby's *History of the Baptists*. Benedict's *General History of the Baptists*, vol. i. ch. v. Toulmin's *Supplement to Neal's History of the Puritans*, ii. 169, &c. iii. 543, &c. iv. 308, &c. 493, &c. v. 115, &c. 239, &c. Bogue and Bennet's *Hist. of Dissenters*, i. 147, &c. *Tr.*]

CHAPTER VII.

HISTORY OF THE SOCINIANS AND ARIANS.

§ 1. Flourishing state of the Socinians—§ 2. Socinians at Altorf—§ 3. Adversities of the Polish Socinians—§ 4, 5. Fate of the Exiles—§ 6. The Arians.

§ 1. THE condition of the Socinians, at the commencement of this century, seemed in many respects to rest on a firm basis. For they not only enjoyed the fullest religious liberty in Transylvania and Luzko [in Volhynia], but they had also, in Poland, a distinguished school at Rakow, furnished with teachers eminent for learning and talents, a printing establishment, numerous congregations, and many patrons, who were men of the highest rank. Elated with this prosperity, they thought proper to make great efforts to extend their church, or to obtain friends and patrons in other countries. And it may be shown by numerous proofs that emissaries of these Polish Socinians, in the beginning of this century, were active in Holland, England, Germany, and Prussia, and that they endeavoured to make proselytes among the great and the learned. For while most other sects endeavour first to make friends among the common people, this sect, which exalts reason alone, has the peculiarity, that it does not much seek the favour and friendship of women, the illiterate, and persons of inferior rank, but labours to recommend itself especially to persons of high rank and eminent talents.

§ 2. Though these missions were, for the most part, committed to men of birth and genius, yet their results, in most places, did not answer the expectations of their projectors. Nowhere did there seem to be a greater prospect of success, than in the university of Altorf, in the territory of Nuremberg. For here *Ernest Sohner*, a physician and Peripatetic philosopher, a man of great acuteness and subtlety, and a professor of philosophy, who had joined the Socinians while he resided in Holland, found it the more easy to instil into the minds of his hearers the doctrines of his new brethren, because he was in high reputation for learning and genuine piety. But after his death, in 1612, this new Socinian party, being deprived of their guide and head, could not manage their affairs so craftily as to elude the vigilance of the other professors of the university. Hence, the

whole matter being fully exposed in 1616, this already mature and daily increasing pest was suddenly arrested and destroyed, by the zealous and dexterous severity of the Nuremberg magistrates. The foreigners, who were infected with the heresy, saved themselves by flight: the infected citizens of Nuremberg allowed themselves to be reclaimed, and returned to correct principles.¹

§ 3. Neither could the Socinian sect long hold that high ground which it appeared to occupy in Poland.² The chief pillar that supported it was removed in the year 1638, by a decree of the Polish diet. For in this year some students of the school at Rakow wantonly threw stones at a wooden statue of our Saviour extended on the cross, and demolished it. For this offence the Papists took such severe revenge, that they procured the fatal law to be enacted at Warsaw, which commanded the school at Rakow to be broken up, the instructors to be banished in disgrace, the printing establishment to be destroyed, and the Socinian church to be closed. All this was executed forthwith, and without abatement, in spite of every effort which the powerful patrons of the sect could put forth.³ This first calamity was the harbinger of that dire tempest, which twenty years after completely overthrew the glory and prosperity of the sect. For in a diet at Warsaw, in 1658, all the Socinians, dispersed throughout Poland, were commanded to quit the country; and it was made a capital offence, either to profess their doctrines, or to harbour others who professed them. Three years were allowed to the proscribed, for the disposal of their property, and the settlement of their affairs. But soon after, the cruelty of their enemies reduced it to two years. Finally, in the year 1661, the tremendous edict was renewed; and all the Socinians that remained were most inhumanly driven from Poland, with immense loss, not merely of property, but also of the health and the lives of many persons.⁴

§ 4. A part of the exiles took their course towards Transylvania; and nearly all these perished by divers calamities.⁵ Others were

¹ A very full and learned history of this whole business, derived chiefly from unpublished documents and papers, was drawn up by a late divine of the university of Altorf, Gustavus George Zeltner, entitled, *Historia Crypto-Socinismi Altorfinæ quondam Academiæ infesti Arcana*; which was published by Gebauer, Leipsic, 1729, 2 vols. 4to. [Sohner kept up a brisk correspondence with the Polish Socinians; who sent a number of Polish youths to Altorf, with their private tutors, to aid in spreading Socinian principles. It was intended not only to diffuse these principles in and around Altorf, but to communicate them also to other German universities. See Schroeckh's *Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation*, v. 625, &c. *Tr.*]

² On the flourishing state of the Socinian cause, especially of the Racovian school, under the rectorship of Martin Ruarus, see Jo. Möller's *Cimbria Litterata*, i. 572, in his

life of Ruarus, a very learned man of Holstein, who, it appears, had embraced Socinianism.

³ *Epistola de Wissowatii Vita*, in Sand's *Bibliotheca Antitrinitaria*, p. 233. Gust. Geo. Zeltner's *Historia Crypto-Socinismi Altorfini*, i. 299.

⁴ Stanisł. Lubieniezy, *Historia Reform. Polonica*, l. iii. c. 17, 18, p. 279, &c. *Equitis Poloniae Vindiciæ pro Unitariis. in Polonia Religiosis Libertas*: in Sand's *Biblioth. Antitrinit.* p. 267, and many others.

⁵ [Some say there were 380 of these refugees; others say 500. On the borders of Hungary, they were assaulted and plundered, so that when they arrived at Clausenburg, in Transylvania, they were almost naked. Disease now attacked them, and carried them nearly all off. See J. G. Walch's *Einleit. in die rel. Streit. aus d. Ev. Luth. Kirche*, iv. 275. *Von Einem.*]

dispersed in the provinces adjacent to Poland, Silesia, Brandenburg, and Prussia, where their posterity still remain, scattered here and there. A considerable number of the more respectable families settled for a time at Creutzberg, in Silesia, under the protection of the Duke of Brieg.¹ Others went to more distant countries, Holland, England, Holstein, and Denmark, to see if they could obtain a comfortable settlement for themselves and their brethren. The most active and zealous in such embassies was *Stanislaus Lubieniezky*, a very learned Polish gentleman, who rendered himself acceptable to great men, by his eloquence, politeness, and sagacity. In the years 1661 and 1662, he came very near to obtaining a secure residence for the Socinians at Altona, from *Frederic III.*, king of Denmark; at Frederickstadt, from *Christ. Albert*, duke of Holstein, 1662; and at Mannheim, from *Charles Lewis*, the elector Palatine. But all his efforts and expectations were frustrated by the remonstrances and entreaties of the theologians; in Denmark, by *John Svaning*, bishop of Seeland; in Holstein, by *John Reinboth*, the general superintendent; in the Palatinate, by *John Lewis Fabricius* [doctor and professor of theology at Heidelberg].² The others who undertook such negotiations, had much less success than he: nor could any nation of Europe be persuaded to allow the enemies of Christ's divinity freely to practise their worship among them.

§ 5. Such, therefore, as remain of this unhappy people, live concealed in various countries of Europe, especially in Brandenburg, Prussia, England, and Holland, and hold here and there clandestine meetings for worship: in England, however, it is said, they have public religious meetings, with the connivance of the magistrates.³

¹ *Lubieniezky, Historia Reform. Polon.* cap. xviii. p. 285, where there is quite a long epistle of the Creutzburgers.

² See Sand's *Bibliotheca Antitrinit.* p. 165. *The Life of Lubieniezky*, prefixed to his *Historia Reformat. Polonica*, p. 7, 8. Jo. Möller's *Introductio in Historiam Cherson. Cimbrica*, pt. ii. p. 105, and *Cimbria Litterata*, ii. 487, &c. Jo. Henr. Heidegger's *Life of Jo. Lewis Fabricius*, subjoined to the works of the latter, p. 38.

³ The Socinians residing in Brandenburg were accustomed, a few years ago, to meet at stated times at Königswald, a village near Frankfurt on the Oder. See Jourdain (for he is the author of the paper), *Recueil de Littérature, de Philosophie, et d'Histoire*, p. 44, Amsterd. 1731, 8vo. They also published at Berlin, in 1716, a German confession of their faith, which, with a confutation of it, is printed in *Die Theologische Heb-Opfer*, part x. p. 852. [In Prussian Brandenburg they found some protection, under the kindness of the electoral stadtholder, Bogislaus, prince von Radzivil, who retained some Socinians at his court: and perhaps they would also have obtained religious freedom under the elector *Frederic*

William, had not the states of the duchy insisted on their expulsion. See Fred. Sam. Bock's *Historia Socinianismi Prussici*, p. 55, &c., and Hartknoch's *Preussische Kirchenhistorie*, p. 646, &c. By the indulgence of the above-named elector, they obtained religious freedom in Brandenburg, particularly in New Mark, under the hope that this little company would gradually unite itself with the Protestant churches. They likewise had churches and schools at Landsberg, down to the end of the seventeenth century. After that they were expelled; the protection of the Schwerin family, which they had hitherto enjoyed, now ceasing.—In Holland, the book of John Vökel, a Socinian, *de Vera Religione*, 1642, was burnt; and the states of Holland, in 1653, forbade the publication of Unitarian books, and all religious meetings of Socinians. Yet Andrew Wissowatius procured the famous *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum* to be printed at Amsterdam, though the place is not mentioned on the title-page; and the Socinians have been allowed to reside there, but without the public exercise of their religion. Many of them likewise are concealed among the Mennonites,

Some have united themselves with the *Arminians*, and others with those *Mennonites* who are called *Galenists*: for neither of these sects requires its members very explicitly to declare their religious belief. It is also said, that not a few of these dispersed people are members of the society that bears the name of *Collegiants*. Being thus situated, they have not all been able to retain that form of religion which their fathers transmitted to them. Accordingly, both the learned and the unlearned, without restraint, explain variously those doctrines which distinguish them from other sects; yet they all agree in denying the divine Trinity, and the divinity and atonement of our Saviour.¹

§ 6. Kindred with the Socinians, are the *Arians*, some of whom obtained celebrity in this century, as authors, such as *Christopher Sand*, father and son, and *John Biddle*;² and likewise some of those

and the other sects. *Schl.*—‘The Socinians in England have never made any figure as a *community*, but have rather been dispersed among that great variety of sects that have arisen in the country, where liberty displays its most glorious fruits, and at the same time exhibits its most striking inconveniences. Besides, few ecclesiastics or writers of any note have adopted the theological system, now under consideration, in all its branches. The Socinian doctrine relating to the design and efficacy of the death of Christ had indeed many abettors in England, during the seventeenth century; and it may be presumed without temerity, that its votaries are rather increased than diminished in the present; but those divines who have abandoned the *Athanasian* hypothesis, concerning the Trinity of persons in the Godhead, have more generally gone into the *Arian* and *Semi-Arian* notions of that inexplicable subject, than into those of the Socinians, who deny that Jesus Christ existed before his appearance in the human nature. The famous John Biddle, after having maintained, both in public and private, during the reign of Charles I. and the protectorship of Cromwell, the Unitarian system, erected an independent congregation in London, which is the only British church we have heard of, in which all the peculiar doctrines of Socinianism were inculcated.’ *Macl.*—Since Maclaine wrote, the Socinians, under the name of Unitarians, have become a considerable body in England, their opinions having been placed by several teachers and writers of ability in a favourable point of view. Still, their sect has never been extensively popular, and it bears no sort of proportion, as to numbers, to either of the two great Methodistic bodies. Its chief strength lies in the old congregations formed originally by Presbyterians, which have very generally gone over to it. *S.*]

¹ This is evident from many proofs, and

among others, from the example of Samuel Crell, the most learned man among the Socinians a few years since; who, although he sustained the office of a teacher among them, yet deviated in many respects from the doctrines of Socinus and of the Racovian Catechism; nor did he wish to be called a Socinian, but an *Artemonite*. See *Journal Littéraire*, tom. xvii. pt. i. p. 150, and my own remarks on this man, in my *Syntagma Diss. ad sanctiores Disciplinas pertinentium*, p. 352. *Unschuldige Nachrichten*, 1750, p. 942. *Nouveau Dictionnaire Hist. Crit.* tom. ii. pt. ii. p. 88, &c.

² Of both the Sands, Arnold [*Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*, vol. ii. book xvii. ch. xiii. § 25, p. 176, &c.] and others give account. Respecting Biddle, see *Nouveau Dictionnaire Hist. Crit.* t. i. pt. ii. p. 288, &c. [Sand the elder was of Creutzberg in Prussia, studied law, and filled various offices at Königsberg; but was deprived in 1668, because he would not renounce Arianism. After this he lived in retirement, and wrote only some vindications and apologies. Yet he aided his son in the composition of his works; and, outliving him, published some of them after his death. The son called himself *Christopher Christophori Sandius*; and wrote, besides his *Biblioth. Antitrinitariorum*, his *Nucleus Historiæ Ecclesiast.* on the first four centuries, in which he attempts to prove, that the early fathers before the council of Nice held Arian sentiments; and that Athanasius was the first that broached the common belief among Christians respecting the Trinity. He also wrote *Interpretationes Paradoxæ Quatuor Evangeliorum*; *de Origine Animæ*; *Problema Paradoxum de Spiritu Sancto*; and (under the name of Herm. Cingallus) *Scriptura Trinitatis Revelatrix*. The son died in 1680 (aged 40), and the father in 1686. *Schl.*—See also concerning the younger Sand, Rees’ *Cyclopædia*, art. *Sandius*.—

comprehended under the general appellation of *Antitrinitarians*, or *Unitarians*. For this [latter] name is applied to various sorts of persons, who agree in this only, that they will not admit of any real distinction in the divine nature. The name of *Arians* is likewise given to all those in general, who represent our Saviour to be inferior to God the Father. And as this may be done in various ways, it is manifest that this word, as now used, must have various significations; and that all who are now called *Arians*, do not agree with the ancient *Arians*; nor do they all hold one and the same sentiment.

CHAPTER VIII.

HISTORY OF SOME MINOR SECTS.

§ 1, 2. The Collegiants—§ 3. The Labadists—§ 4. Bourignon and Poiret—§ 5. The Philadelphian Society.

§ 1. It may be proper here to give some account of certain sects which could not be conveniently noticed in the history of the larger communities, but which, for various reasons, should not be passed over in total silence. While the Arminian disputes in Holland were most warm, in the year 1619, arose that class of people who hold sacred conventions twice a year at *Rheinsburg* in Holland, not far from Leyden, and who are known by the name of *Collegiants*. The institution originated from three brothers, by the name of *Koddeus*, or *van der Kodde*; namely, *John James*, *Hudrian*, and *Gisbert*; obscure men, in rural life, but, according to report, pious, well acquainted with their Bibles, and opposed to religious controversies. They were joined by one *Anthony Cornelius*, who was also an illiterate and obscure man. The descendants and followers of these men acquired

John Biddle was born in 1615, educated at Oxford, became master of a free school in Gloucester, 1641. Here he soon became suspected of heresy; and from 1644, till his death in 1662, he passed a large part of his time in various prisons and in exile. Whenever he was at liberty, he wrote and preached in favour of his sentiments, which caused him to be frequently apprehended, and to undergo a criminal prosecution. In 1651 he published two catechisms; in which, *Mr. Neal* says, he maintained, '1. That God is confined to a certain place. 2. That he has a bodily shape. 3. That he has passions. 4. That he is neither omnipotent nor unchangeable. 5. That we are not to believe three persons in the Godhead. 6. That Jesus Christ has not the nature of God, but only a divine lordship. 7. That

he was not a priest while upon earth. 8. That there is no deity in the Holy Ghost.' According to *Dr. Toulmin*, these are not formal *propositions*, but only *questions* in his catechisms, to which he subjoins texts of Scripture by way of answer. Thus the first proposition is this question: 'Is not God, according to the current of the Scripture, in a certain place, namely, in heaven?' The answer consists of twenty-nine passages of Scripture, which represent God as 'looking from heaven,' as, 'Our Father, who art in heaven,' &c. See *Neal's Hist. of the Puritans*, iv. 167, &c. ed. Boston, 1817. *Toulmin's Review of the Life, Character, and Writings of Mr. John Biddle*. *Brook's Lives of the Puritans*, iii. 411, &c. *Rees' Cyclopædia*, art. *Biddle*. Tr.]

the name of *Collegiants*, from the circumstance that they called their assemblies *Colleges*. All persons may be admitted into the society, who merely account the Bible a divine book, and endeavour to live according to its precepts, whatever may be their opinions respecting God and the Christian religion. The brethren, who are considerably numerous in most of the cities and villages of Holland, Friesland, and West Friesland, assemble twice a week, namely, on Sundays and Wednesdays; and after singing a hymn, and offering a prayer, they take up some passage of the New Testament, which they illustrate and explain. With the exception of females, whom they do not allow to speak in public, all persons, of whatever rank or order, are at liberty to bring forward their thoughts and offer them to the consideration of the brethren: and all are at liberty to oppose, modestly and soberly, whatever the brethren advance. They have printed lists of the texts of Scripture which are to be discussed at their several meetings, so that each person may examine the passages at home, and come prepared to speak. Twice a year, the brethren assemble at Rheinsburg, where they have spacious buildings, destined for the education of orphan children, and for the reception of strangers; and there spend four days together, in listening to exhortations to holiness and love, and in celebrating the Lord's Supper. Here also, such as wish it, are baptized; but it is in the ancient manner, immersing the whole body in water. The brethren of Friesland, at the present day, assemble once a year, at Leuwarden, and there observe the holy supper, because Rheinsburg is too distant for them conveniently to go thither. In short, by the *Collegiants*, we are to understand a very large society of persons of every sect and rank, who assume the name of Christians, but entertain different views of Christ; and which is kept together neither by rulers and teachers, nor by ecclesiastical laws, nor by a formula of faith, nor, lastly, by any set of rites, but solely by the desire of improvement in scriptural knowledge and piety.¹

§ 2. In such an association, which allows all its members to think as they please, and which has no formula of faith, dissensions and controversies cannot easily arise. Yet, in the year 1672, there was no little dispute between *John* and *Paul Breitenburg*, merchants of Rotterdam, and *Abraham Lemmermann* and *Francis Cuiper*, merchants of Amsterdam. *John Breitenburg* (or *Bredenburg*, as he is generally called) had established a peculiar sort of *College*, in which he expounded the religion of reason and nature. This was disapproved of by *Lemmermann* and *Cuiper*, who wished to have reason excluded from any combination with religion. The dispute grew warmer, as *Bredenburg* diverged towards the opinions of *Spinoza*, and defended them, and yet wished to be regarded as a Christian.² Some other

¹ See the *Dissertation sur les Usages de ceur qu'on appelle en Hollande Collégiens et Rhinobourgeois*, which is in the splendid work, *Cérémonies religieuses de tous les Peuples du Monde*, iv. 323, &c. Also a

book published by the Collegiants themselves, entitled, *De Oorspronck, Nataur, Handelwijze en Oogmerk der zo genaamde Rynburgsche Vergadering*, Amstr 1736, 4to.

² John Bredenburg and Francis Cuiper

minor contests arose at the same time. The result of the whole was, that the *Collegiants*, in 1686, were split into two opposing sects, and held their conventions in separate edifices at Rheinsburg. But on the death of the authors of these discords, near the beginning of the next century, the schism began to heal, and the *Collegiants* returned to their former union and harmony.¹

§ 3. *John Labadie*, a Frenchman, eloquent, and a man of genius, was first a Jesuit; being dismissed from their society, he joined the Reformed, and sustained the office of a preacher with reputation, in France, Switzerland, and Holland. He at length set up a new sect, which formed a settlement first at Middleburg, in Zealand, and then at Amsterdam, and afterwards, in 1670, established itself at Herford, a town in Westphalia, under the patronage of *Elizabeth*, princess Palatine, the abbess of Herford; and being driven from that place, it removed to Altona, in 1672; and on the death of its founder in 1674, retired to the castle of Wiewert, in West Friesland: but it has long since become extinct. This sect was joined not only by several men of considerable learning, but also by that Minerva of the seventeenth century, the very learned lady of Utrecht, *Anna Maria Schurmann*. This little community did not wish to be thought to differ from the Reformed, in regard to religious opinions and doctrines, so much as in manners and rules of discipline. For its lawgiver exhibited a rigorous and austere model of sanctity for the imitation of his followers; and conceived, that not only the invisible church, but also the visible, ought to be a community of sanctified persons, earnestly striving after perfection in holiness. Several of his tracts are extant, which show him to have possessed a lively and ardent mind, but not well disciplined and polished; and as persons of such a character are easily betrayed by their natural temperament into errors and

are well known among the followers and the adversaries of Spinoza; but what sort of men they were, has been unknown generally. Bredenburg, a collegiant and a merchant of Rotterdam, openly taught the doctrine of Spinoza, and demonstrated its accordance with reason mathematically. At the same time, he not only professed to be a Christian, but actually explained, recommended, and defended Christianity in the meetings of the Collegiants, and declared it to be of divine origin. This man of a singular genius reconciled these two contradictory things, by maintaining that reason was opposed to religion; but yet, that we ought to believe in the religion contained in the New Testament Scriptures against the most evident and the most conclusive mathematical demonstrations. He must, therefore, have believed in a twofold truth, theological and mathematical; and have held that to be false in theology, which is true in philosophy. The best account of Bredenburg is given by the learned Jew, Isaac Orobio, in his *Certamen*

philosophicum propugnata Veritatis divinæ et naturalis adversus Jo. Bredenburgii principia, ex quibus quod religio rationi repugnat, demonstrare nititur. This book, which contains Bredenburg's demonstrations of the doctrines of Spinoza, was first published, Amsterd. 1703, 8vo, and then, Brussels, 1731, 4to. Bredenburg's adversary, Francis Cuiper, rendered his name famous by his *Arcana Atheismi detecta*, written in opposition to Bredenburg. Cuiper was a bookseller of Amsterdam, and published, among other things, the *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum seu Unitariorum*. Those acquainted with literary history, know that Cuiper, on account of that very book above mentioned, which he wrote against Bredenburg, became suspected of Spinozism, notwithstanding he was a Collegiant, and a strenuous defender of Christianity, and of the harmony of reason with religion.

¹ Besides those already named, see Simon Fred. Rues, *Nachrichten vom Zustande der Mennoniten*, p. 267, &c.

faults, I am not sure whether those witnesses are to be wholly disregarded, who charge his life and doctrine with many blemishes.¹

§ 4. Nearly at the same time, *Antoinette Bourignon de la Porte*, a lady of Flanders, boasted that she was inspired of God, and instructed supernaturally, to restore the Christian religion, which had become extinct and lost among the disputes and contentions of the different sects. This woman, who possessed a voluble tongue, uncommonly ardent feelings, and an inexhaustible imagination, filled the provinces of Holland, and also Holstein (where she spent some years), with the fame of her flights of fancy; and she persuaded some among the learned, as well as the ignorant and unlearned, to believe her declarations. After various sufferings and conflicts, she died at Franeker in Friesland, in the year 1680. It would require a prophet and diviner to make out from her writings, which are numerous, a neat and consistent system of theology. For that divine light which guides persons of this character, never proceeds in a regular and methodical way; and it spreads a thick darkness before the minds of those who investigate truth, not by feeling, but by the understanding. Yet a reflecting person, who is versed in church history, may easily discover that this woman, who had not full command of her reason, derived a large part of her oracles from the writings of the mystic doctors; and what she derived from these sources, the extravagance of her fancy made worse than it was before. Neglecting all the details of her system, the substance of it is, that religion consists in an internal *emotion* or sensation of the soul, and not in either knowledge or practice.² Among her patrons, the most distinguished were, *Christian Bartholomew de Cordt*, a priest of the Oratory at Mechlin, a Jansenist, who died on the island of Nordstrand in Jutland;³ and *Peter Poiret*, a man of penetrating genius, and well versed in the Cartesian philosophy, who has clearly evinced, by his own example, that knowledge and ignorance, reason and superstition, are not so mutually repulsive that they cannot reside in the same breast, and by their united energies engender monstrous productions.⁴

¹ See Jo. Möller's *Cimbria Litterata*, iii. 35, &c.; and *Isagoge ad Histor. Chersones. Cimbrica*, pt. ii. cap. v. p. 121, &c. Add Godfrey Arnold's *Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*, vol. i. pt. ii. book xvii. ch. xxi. p. 1186. Weismann's *Hist. Eccl. Seculi XVII.* p. 927, and others. Concerning the two celebrated companions and colleagues of Labadie, Peter du Lignon and Peter Yvon, see Möller's *Cimbria Litterata*, ii. 472, 1020. [Labadie exhibited through life the character of an indiscreet reformer. To lash the vices of the people, and to purge the churches of their offences against purity, was his great business. But it was his misfortune always to get into difficulty. The irreligious abhorred him, and the pious were dissatisfied with him. Hence he removed from place to place, was at length excommunicated by the French churches in Holland, and set up a church of his own.

But this church rendered itself so odious, that it was persecuted, and driven from place to place, so long as Labadie was at the head of it. The charges against him were very numerous and weighty, and respected both his orthodoxy and his morals; but it is questionable whether, if fairly tried, he would be found to be anything more than a rash, indiscreet, enthusiastical man. *Tr.*]

² See Jo. Möller, who treats expressly and fully respecting her, in his *Cimbria Litterata*, ii. 85, &c. and in his *Introduct. in Historiam Chersonesi Cimbrica*, pt. ii. p. 151, &c. Peter Bayle, *Dictionnaire Hist. et Crit.* i. 639. Godf. Arnold, *Kirchen- und Ketzer-historie*, ii. 153, &c. and others.

³ See concerning him, Möller's *Cimbria Litterata*, ii. 149.

⁴ Poiret systematised and explained the wild and incoherent rhapsodies of Bourri-

§ 5. Of the same, or at least similar views, the same plans, and the same general character, was *Jane Leade*, who, near the end of the century, blinded not only many of the common people in England, but also some of the better informed, by her visions, her prophecies, her promises, and her doctrines, and thus gave rise to the *Philadelphian Society*. For she believed in general, that all contentions among Christians would wholly cease, and that the church of Christ would become the only, the perfectly united, and the most beautiful church here on earth; provided all would commit their souls to the *internal teacher*, to be moulded, enlightened, and governed by Him, neglecting all other doctrines, precepts, and opinions. And she did not hesitate to give assurance, in the name of God, that such a church as her own imagination had conceived, would be established before the end of the world. And the honest woman might with more confidence give this assurance, as she fully believed that her *Philadelphian Society* was that very church of Christ, in which alone the Holy Spirit resided and reigned. Her other discoveries, among which was the noted *restoration of all things*, need not be related. *Leade* was less fortunate than *Bourignon* in this respect, that she had not so eloquent and sagacious a counsellor as *Poiret* to plead her cause: for her principal associates, *John Pordage*, a physician, and *Thomas Bromley*, were more distinguished for piety and a contemplative turn of mind, than for their power of reasoning and their eloquence. *Pordage*, in particular, even surpassed our *Boehmen*, whom he greatly admired, in obscurity; and instead of enlightening his readers, shocks them with his uncouth phraseology.¹

gnon, in a great work, which he entitled, *L'Economie divine, ou Système universel*; first published in French, Amsterd. 1686, 7 vols. 8vo, and afterwards published in Latin. Respecting this celebrated mystic philosopher, whose various writings procured him notoriety, see the *Bibliotheca Bremens. Theol. Philol.* iii. 75.

¹ See Jo. Wolfg. Jaeger, *Historia sacra et civilis Seculi XVII.* decenn. x. p. 90, &c. Peter Poiret, *Bibliotheca Mysticor.* p. 161, 174, 283, 286, and others. [Jane Leade, who died 1704, in the 81st year of her age, spent nearly her whole life in reading and recommending the writings of Boehmen, and in penning down her own revelations and new results of divine truths. She was rich, and printed the whole at her own cost. Hence great numbers of her

writings came before the public. The *Philadelphian Society* was established by her in 1697: the causes and reasons for its institution, she published in 1698. Her writings fill eight volumes.—Pordage was first a preacher, but afterwards, being deposed for his fanaticism, he became a physician. He was the most zealous promoter of the Boehmist doctrines and of the *Philadelphian Society* in England. His principal work was his *Divine and true Metaphysics*, in 3 vols. 8vo. He also wrote a *Theologia Mystica*; and died in 1698.—Bromley was his pupil and adherent, and wrote much on the Bible. In Holland, one Lot Fisher, a physician, was a promoter of the *Philadelphian Society*; and he caused all the above works to be splendidly published in Dutch. *Schl.*]

A BRIEF SKETCH
OF THE
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
OF THE
EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

CHAPTER I.

§ 1. Preface — § 2. Prosperous events of the church generally, and especially of the Papal church — § 3. The Jesuits and their institutions in China — § 4. Protestant missions — § 5. Adverse events. Private enemies of Christianity — § 6. Atheists: Deists — § 7. Roman church: the pontiffs — § 8. Prospects of peace between the Evangelical and the Papists frustrated — § 9. Intestine discords of the Roman church. Jansenist contests — § 10. Quesnel. The bull *Unigenitus* — § 11. Commotions from it in France — § 12. Supports of the Jansenists in France. Francis de Paris — § 13. State of the Eastern church — § 14. External state of the Lutheran church — § 15. Its internal state — § 16. Intestine foes — § 17. The Herrenbutters. Zinzendorf — § 18. Cultivation of philosophy among the Lutherans — § 19. The Wertheim translation — § 20. Pietistic controversies — § 21. State of the Reformed church — § 22. Projects for union between the Lutherans and the Reformed — § 23. State of the English church — § 24. Various sects in England. Whitefield — § 25. State of the Dutch church — § 26. Controversy in Switzerland respecting the *Formula Consensus* — § 27. The Socinians. Arians.

§ 1. THE ecclesiastical history of the century now passing affords matter for a volume, rather than for a few pages; and may expect, among those who come after us, an ingenuous and faithful historian of its own. But that the present summary may not be thought incomplete, and that I myself, as well, perhaps, as others, may have a thread which would be useful in lecturing, I will just run over the principal subjects, and in a few words state the occurrences most worthy of notice in our own age. That the size of the book may not be unnecessarily swelled, authorities will be omitted. For what man of learning is so ignorant of the state of literature, as not to know, that there are innumerable works, from which our dry and insipid narrative might be filled out and made interesting?

§ 2. The Christian name has been propagated with equal zeal, by papists and protestants, in Asia, America, and Africa. I say the

Christian *name*, not the Christian *religion*. For it is demonstrable, that very many of those whom the Roman missionaries persuade to forsake idolatry, show themselves to be Christians only in name, and as to certain ceremonies and outward forms, not in reality and in spirit; nor do they quit superstition, but only exchange one species of it for another. Among the papists the Jesuits, and among the Jesuits the French especially, are represented as explaining genuine Christianity, with distinguished success, to barbarous nations which knew not God. And the fact is not to be denied, provided it is allowable to call those people Christians, who have some knowledge of Christ, however imperfect it may be. At least it is true that the French have gathered large congregations of such Christians in the East Indies, especially in the Carnatic, Madura, and Marawar, on the coast of Malabar, and in China, Tonquin, and elsewhere; and also in some provinces of America, since the time that *Anthony Veri* assumed the office of superintendent of the sacred missions, and by great efforts procured both men and money adequate for so great an undertaking. But these missionaries have been so far from effacing the former stain upon the character of the Jesuit preachers, that they rather deepened it. For they are represented as pursuing their own honour and emolument rather than the interests of Christ: and as ingeniously corrupting to a strange extent our Saviour's holy religion, in order to obtain more proselytes.

§ 3. That famous question, whether the Jesuits residing in China advocated the cause of Christ well or ill among that discerning people, who are so exceedingly attached to their ancient rites, was decided in the year 1704, by *Clement XI.*, in a manner adverse to the Jesuits. For he declared it criminal for the new Christians to practise the rites of their ancestors; and especially those rites by which the Chinese honour their deceased ancestors and *Confucius*. But this severe edict was considerably mitigated in the year 1715; and, doubtless, for the sake of appeasing the angry Jesuits. For the pontiff decreed, that it is allowable for the teachers of the Chinese to designate the divine nature by the word *Tien*, provided they add the word *Tchu*, to remove the ambiguity of the word *Tien*, and to make it appear that the Christian teachers adored the *Lord of heaven* (for this is the meaning of the phrase *Tien-Tchu*), and not heaven itself. He also allowed those rites to be practised which gave so much offence to the adversaries of the Jesuits; provided all superstition and appearance of religion were avoided, and that these rites were regarded as mere testimonies of respect for their ancestors, or as marks of civil honour. The Chinese Christians, therefore, according to this decree of *Clement*, may keep in their houses tablets, on which are written in golden letters the names of their ancestors and of *Confucius*: they may lawfully honour them with lighted candles, with incense, and with tables set out with viands, fruits, and spices: nay, they may address these tablets and the graves of their ancestors as supplicants, prostrating themselves to the ground. The first or more severe edict was carried to China, by *Charles Thomas Tournon*, in the year 1705; and the

second or milder one, by *Charles Ambrose Mezzabarba*, in the year 1721. But neither of them satisfied the emperor and the Jesuits. *Tournon*, executing the commands of his master with less prudence than the case required, was, by order of the emperor, thrown into prison, where he died in the year 1710. *Mezzabarba*, though much more cautious and prudent, returned without effecting his object: for the emperor could by no means be persuaded to allow any innovations to be made in the ancient customs and institutions of the country. At present, the state of Christianity in China being extremely precarious and dubious, this controversy is entirely suspended. And many considerations induce us to suppose that the pontiff and the accusers of the Jesuits hinder by no obstacles the members of that society from adhering to their own regulations, rather than to those sent them from Rome. For many evils must be patiently borne, in order to avoid that greatest of evils, the overthrow of the Romish religion in China.¹

§ 4. The English and the Dutch, but especially the former, have made much greater efforts than formerly to spread the knowledge of Christianity among the nations of Asia and America.² Among the efforts of this kind by Lutherans, the noblest and most successful is the institution of *Frederic IV.*, king of Denmark; who, in the year 1706, sent out missionaries to preach Christian truth to the Indians on the coast of Malabar.³ This mission, the purest and best of all, not only still flourishes, being supported by the very best regulations, but also, through the munificence of that excellent king, *Christian VI.*, it is daily becoming more and more brilliant. The men who labour in it, I admit, make fewer Christians than the papal missionaries; but they make far better ones—real disciples, and not apes of disciples, of Jesus Christ. The Russians have bestowed labour, not in vain, for the conversion of some of the nations bordering on Siberia.

§ 5. While the glory of Jesus Christ has been increasing in the remotest parts of our world, through the labours, the perils, and the anxious solitudes of these missionaries, great numbers in Europe

¹ [All these events are stated far more fully in Dr. Mosheim's *Most recent Ecclesiastical History of China* (in German), Rostock, 1748, 8vo. In opposition to this, was published at Augsburg in 1758, 8vo, and at Innspruck, *The most recent events in China; with a solid confutation of many unjust and erroneous statements of Dr. Mosheim, in his Most recent Eccl. Hist. of China*, written from Pekin, by R. P. Floriano Bahr, then rector of the Jesuits' college in China. But this refutation only makes the correctness of Mosheim's book appear the more manifest. *Schl.*]

² [The English Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts was founded in 1701, principally by the exertions of Dr. Bray; and with the intention of supplying the spiritual wants of the American colonies. A most interesting account

of its early operations may be found in the *History of the Colonial Church*, by the Rev. J. S. M. Anderson, London, 1856, in three volumes. *Ed.*]

³ [The first of these Danish missionaries were Ziegenbalg and Plutsch. They sailed for India in 1705. As early as 1709, great part of the charges of this mission was undertaken by the English Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; upon which, later, the whole care of the work devolved. The society established a mission at Madras in 1728, under Schulze, who returned to Europe in 1742. Christian Frederick Swartz, the most eminent of the Lutheran missionaries, was sent from England. The care of the East Indian missions was transferred to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in 1824. See Anderson, *Col. Church*, iii. 1—22. *Ed.*]

have made it their business to obscure this glory and to tread it in the dust. There is no country of Europe, and scarcely any body of Christians, in our age, which does not nourish in its bosom persons who endeavour either to blot out all religion and all fear of God, or at least to sink the dignity and lessen the influence of Christianity. Nowhere does this pest to the human race more abound, nowhere does it more boldly come forth to the light of day, than in the free states of Holland and England. Nor is it rare to meet, especially in England, with books which impudently deride and set at nought, not only the whole religion of Christ, but also the honour, worship, and majesty of the Divine Being, and all virtue and morality. Infamous for the publication of such books are *John Toland*, *Antony Collins*, *Matthew Tindal*, *Thomas Woolston* (a strange specimen of ingenuity abused, who attempted, with an effrontery quite absurd, to shake the credibility of our Saviour's miracles), *Thomas Morgan*, *John Chubb*, *John Mandeville*, and several others. And not long will any country of Europe, especially those which have abandoned Roman sacred rites, be free from writers of this character, if the booksellers continue to exercise the power which now they have, in giving all sorts of crack-brained and senseless papers a chance of escaping destruction by means of the press.

§ 6. The sects of *Atheists*, that is, of people who deny that a Being infinitely wise and powerful exists, at whose pleasure this universe was framed, and by whose nod it is preserved, are almost extinct. For at the present day, those actuated by this frenzy, omitting all disputation, agree to the doctrines of *Spinoza*, and consider this whole material world as an automaton, which, by means of some internal energy, originates and produces various movements, all of which are the result of necessity. The tribe of *Deists*, or of persons who assail the truth of all revealed religions, and especially of the Christian religion, disagree very much, and are divided into various sects. The best of them—though these are bad enough—are those who endeavour to merge Christianity in natural religion, maintaining that Christ only republished the lost and obliterated precepts of nature or correct reason. Of this class are *Tindal*, *Chubb*, *Mandeville*, *Morgan*, and many others among the English; if indeed they really believed what their words express. To the same class belongs *Muralt*, or whoever may be the unfortunately eloquent and ingenious author of a recent French work on what is essential in religion.¹ For, according to his opinion, the whole system of religion is comprised in these three propositions: There is a God: He watches over human affairs: The soul is immortal. And to inculcate these three truths, by his precepts and example, was the object of Christ's mission.

§ 7. The Roman church in this century has been governed by *Clement XI.*,² *Innocent XIII.*,³ *Benedict XIII.*,⁴ *Clement XII.*,⁵

¹ [*Lettres sur la Religion essentielle à l'Homme, distinguée de ce qui n'en est que l'Accessoire.* *Macl.*]

² [A.D. 1700—21. *Tr.*]

³ [1721—24. *Tr.*]

⁴ [1724—30. *Tr.*]

⁵ [1730—40. *Tr.*]

*Benedict XIV.*¹ All these may be pronounced holy, wise, and learned men, if compared with the pontiffs of former times. The most distinguished of them for learning and erudition are *Clement XI.* and the present pontiff, *Benedict XIV.*, whose former name was *Prosper Lambertini*. The most distinguished for piety, or rather for a show of it, was *Benedict XIII.* This last-named pontiff attempted, by means of a council which he held in the Lateran palace in 1725, the acts and decrees of which have been published, to correct the greater evils in the church, and to reform the very corrupt morals of the clergy of every rank. But the event did not answer his expectations. Nor will *Benedict XIV.* be more successful, who is now attempting the same thing, though by different means. Moreover, the modern pontiffs differ exceedingly from their predecessors, in the extent of their prerogatives, and in their power and influence. For the civil powers and states, though they treat the pontiffs personally with high respect and honour, yet are continually depressing and humbling the *court* of Rome, which they wisely discriminate from the pontiff. This appears, among other things, from the contests of the pontiffs in the present age with the kings of France, Portugal, Sardinia, and Naples; from no one of which the pontiffs have been able to get free without giving way.

§ 8. A reconciliation of the protestants with the papists, if we except some feeble efforts of certain individuals, has not been seriously and earnestly attempted; nor indeed was it quite possible. For those who formerly attempted this thing, endeavoured principally to gain over the protestants by explaining away and lowering down the [most offensive] Roman doctrines; but *Clement XI.* deprived the pacificators of this their principal resource by publishing that very noted decree, called the Bull *Unigenitus*. For this has shown most clearly, that on most of the points which obliged our ancestors to separate from the Romish communion, the present doctrine of the papists is precisely the same that it formerly appeared to be. This disclosure being made, it became manifest, that those who had formerly offered us peace on very conciliatory terms, had only laid a trap for us, by their pretended expositions of the Romish faith, and that no confidence whatever could be reposed on the promises of such men.

§ 9. The intestine discords, which greatly disquieted the Romish community in the preceding century, were so far from being composed and settled in this, that they have rather acquired new strength, and raged with increased animosity. The Jesuits still contend with the Dominicans and others, though with a little more decorum, and more covertly. The Franciscans are at variance with the Dominicans. There is also a dispute respecting the nature and lawfulness of the Chinese rites. It would be endless to enumerate all the contests which disturb and disquiet every part of the widely-extended Roman church, sometimes more slightly and sometimes more violently. The

¹ [1740—58. *Tr.*]

principal controversy now dividing the papal empire is that of the Jansenists; which is carried on with various results, particularly in France and the Netherlands. The Jansenists, or Augustinians as they choose to be called, are inferior to the Jesuits in numbers, power, and influence, but are their equals in fortitude, sagacity, and erudition, and their superiors in holiness of life, and in that superstition which dazzles the eyes of the multitude. In France they are oppressed and persecuted, but in the Netherlands they find a ready asylum. The greatest part of those who belong to the Roman church in the Spanish Netherlands, and all such in the United Netherlands, adhere to the Jansenist doctrines. The Dutch papists at this day have almost separated themselves from the Roman pontiff, though they profess the closest adherence to the communion of the Roman church; nor are either the threatenings or the entreaties of the Roman prelate able to reduce these rebellious Batavians to subordination.

§ 10. The greatest support of the Jansenist cause, both in the preceding century and in this, was the New Testament of the very learned and pious *Paschasius Quesnel*, one of the Presbyters of the Oratory, which he translated into French, and accompanied with notes calculated to awaken a sense of religion. For the marrow of the Jansenist doctrines is very elegantly and ingeniously wrought into these notes, so as to infuse it the more agreeably into the mind of the reader. To destroy the influence of this most pernicious engine, the Jesuits induced *Lewis XIV.*, king of France, to solicit a public condemnation of the book from the Roman pontiff, *Clement XI.* The pontiff complied with the wishes of the king, or rather of the Jesuits, and issued in the year 1713 the celebrated *Bull* or decree, which from its first word is called *Unigenitus*, and in which *one hundred and one* propositions taken from that book are proscribed. This edict was of some advantage to the cause of the Jesuits, but it was of immense disadvantage to the whole Roman church; as the wiser men in it themselves admit. For, not to mention that the protestants learned from it, that the Romish community religiously held fast her former corruptions, the subjects of the pontiff, who had no attachment to the Jansenist doctrines, and who were solicitous only to advance truth and piety, were exceedingly offended at this decree. Besides, the Jansenian schism was widened by it, and rendered more bitter and violent.

§ 11. The most violent contests were produced by this unhappy edict, especially in France. Many of the bishops, and a vast number of influential, pious, and learned men, both among the clergy and the laity, appealed from it to a future general council. And especially *Lewis Anthony Noailles*, the archbishop of Paris, manfully opposed it, regardless of the resentments both of the pontiff and the king. These strenuous defenders of the Gallican liberty, and of the religion of their fathers, the pontiffs, kings, and Jesuits laboured to subdue by all sorts of punishments and indignities: and in part they did subdue them; for many became exiles, and retired among their brethren in Holland; others were coerced, by violence and fear, to approve the decree of the pontiff; and others, being deprived of their livings,

their honours, and their offices, removed to foreign countries. At length the matter was carried so far, that this papal edict was declared to be a law of the land. All these measures reduced the nation to some degree of quietude; but they by no means purged it of enemies to the pontiff. Every part of France abounds with *Appellants*, as they are called, who are only waiting for a convenient opportunity for renewing the old controversy, which has never been properly settled.

§ 12. Amidst these calamities, the Jansenists had but two resources by which to defend themselves and their cause against so many powerful enemies, namely, the press and miracles. They attacked, accordingly, the pontiff and the Jesuits in numberless publications, many of which, being written with elegance and solidity, have produced great effect; and as human aids proved insufficient, they called in the help of divine aid. For they persuaded the people that God had conferred a power of healing the most inveterate diseases upon the bones and ashes of certain persons, who had been distinguished for their zeal in the cause of *Jansen*, and who had appealed anew in their last moments to a future council. Among those who were said to have received this glory, the most distinguished was *Francis de Paris*, a deacon of the church of Paris,¹ a man of noble birth, but of a gloomy temperament, and excessively superstitious, and one who had voluntarily brought on his own death by abstinence from food and other self-tortures. To miracles, divine visions were superadded. For many persons, especially at Paris, pretended to be actuated by the Holy Spirit, and uttered prophecies, often of the most insipid character, by which, however, the multitude, as is usual, were greatly affected. But the prudence of the French court put an end to these commotions also: so that, as things now are, the Jansenists have no other means of defence but their genius and their pens.

§ 13. Of the Greek and Oriental church very little can be said; for their ignorance, and the severe oppression under which they live,

¹ *Ecclesiæ Parisiensis diaconus*. [He is called, in a life published by one of his admirers, *Diaconus du Diocèse de Paris*. He would not take priests' orders, professing to feel himself unworthy of them. Hence he was frequently spoken of as *the blessed deacon*. He was eldest son of Nicholas de Paris, counsellor to the parliament of that city. He was born in Paris, June 30, 1690, and showed a remarkably strong sense of religion very early in life. This made him decline the opportunity of succeeding his father, and give up that advantage to a younger brother. As his age advanced, he plunged into all the excesses of an exaggerated penitence, but with perfect singleness of purpose, nothing being further from his thoughts than the desire of public observation. He lived, in fact, in an obscure retreat, and his existence was scarcely known to any but the sick and needy, whom he was ever busied in comforting and relieving.

His privations, probably, cut his life short, as he died May 1, 1727. Within three days afterwards he was interred in the small cemetery of St. Medard's at Paris, which was his parish church, and a flat stone was placed over his grave. This soon became a favourite spot for the devotions of the Jansenist party; and report filling all France, by degrees, with accounts of numerous miraculous cures there, so great a ferment arose as to make the government, in 1731, wall up the spot, and forbid all access to it. The alleged miracles quickly raised controversies through the whole of western Europe, infidels using them to discredit Scripture miracles, and Protestants, the miracles of Romanism. There is a treatise of Mosheim's upon them among his *Dissertationes ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam pertinentes*, ii. 307. They are also examined in Bp. Douglas's *Criterion*, and other works;—Moreri, Mosheim, Douglas. S.]

prevent them from attempting any change in their condition. The Russians, as already stated, under the guidance of the emperor *Peter* the Great, gave their church rather an improved organisation. There still remain, however, vast numbers in that immense empire who would be better pleased with the rude system of their ancestors: and there are some who, if they were able, would exterminate the protestants and the followers of other religions with fire and sword. This is manifest, especially, from a work of *Stephen Javorski* against the heretics. The Greeks are said to meet with more indulgence from their Mahumedan masters. The Nestorians and Monophysites in Asia and Africa perseveringly refuse communion with the Roman see, notwithstanding all the promises and arguments of the papal missionaries. The pontiffs have several times contemplated a new mission to the Abyssinians, but have not yet been able to discover means of eluding the vigilance of a nation so hostile to the Romish religion. Nor is there even a tolerable prospect that the embassy now preparing at Rome to the emperor of Abyssinia will meet with success. The Monophysites in Asia extend the limits of their church as they have opportunity; and not long since they gained over a part of the Nestorians inhabiting the maritime coasts of India.

§ 14. The Lutheran church celebrated, in peace and tranquillity, the *secular* festival of its religion in 1717, and that of the Augsburg Confession in 1730. It received no small accession a few years since, by means of that multitude which abandoned the territories of Salzburg and Berchtolsgraden, in order to profess a purer religion without fear, and emigrated, some to Prussia, others to Holland, and others to America and other countries. The Lutheran church has likewise been increased in consequence of its extension to America and Asia; nor are the Lutheran congregations small in those distant regions. In Germany, on the other hand, as appears from the public documents and from numerous complaints, it has in various places been much oppressed by the adherents to the Roman pontiff, and been very unjustly deprived of a part of its privileges.

§ 15. No change could take place in the doctrines and regulations of the Lutheran church, because those ancient formularies and regulations, in which the public faith and discipline are defined, have remained everywhere undisturbed. But the method of teaching and inculcating these doctrines has not been uniformly the same. At the commencement of the century, it seemed very generally to be the aim to restore every part of Christianity to its ancient simplicity, and to exclude all philosophical terms and reasonings. But in process of time many fell into the opinion, that Christianity could by no means maintain its ground, unless it was supported by the aids of philosophy, and demonstrated mathematically. The jurists, who in the preceding century undertook to reform the system of ecclesiastical law, have prosecuted the object so vigorously in the present century, that we should have had a very different ecclesiastical constitution, if the sovereigns had deemed it for the public good to yield to their counsels and admonitions. Still we may discover here and there

visible traces of the principles which men of great learning are wont to advance, not only respecting the appendages and externals of religion, but also respecting religion itself. Hence it is not strange that there should be warm disputes between them and the clergy on various points. And not only theologians, but also very excellent men among the jurists themselves, have fears lest religion should at length be converted into a mere political engine for the security of civil government, if the opinions of some of these men should acquire authority.

§ 16. The immense licentiousness of thinking, and of spreading among the common people even the vilest and most senseless opinions, which began to prevail in the preceding century, has increased and become more confirmed, everywhere among us, in the present century. Hence there have arisen, and still arise at the present time, so many persons, some of them full of fanatical folly, some delirious and beside themselves, some the fabricators of new religions, who freely divulge all their dreams, and everywhere produce departures from the established rules of faith and practice, or excite discords and contentions. Besides those already named, the following are notorious: *John Tennhart*, *John Geo. Gichtel*, *John William Ueberfeld*, *John Geo. Rosenbach*, *Geo. Christoph. Brendel*, *John Christoph. Seizen*, *Anthony Roemeling*, and many others; who either boast of being guided by a divine impulse, or offer to the credulous multitude, in different ways, and with different success, their fancied modifications and improvements of the church. These men have been opposed by our theologians in numerous publications; but many of them were unworthy of confutation. The greatest part have become convicted of folly by the course of events and actual results, rather than by arguments and reasoning. For as men of this character start up of a sudden, so for the most part they soon ruin their own cause, either by their indiscretions, or by their corrupt morals and shameful conduct, or, lastly, by their disagreement among themselves.

§ 17. Many place the *Herrenhutters* in this class, or those who first associated at *Herrenhut* in Lusatia, under the illustrious count *Zinzendorf*, and who, afterwards increasing, have spread themselves through a large part of Europe, and even travelled to the Indies, Tartary, and the utmost bounds of the earth. They tell us that they are descendants of those Bohemian and Moravian brethren, who in the fifteenth century were excited by the preaching and example of *John Huss* to cast off the Romish yoke. They might more correctly call themselves *imitators* of those brethren; for it is conceded by all, that only a very small part of this new fraternity consists of Bohemians and Moravians; and it is very uncertain, also, whether such of them as are Bohemians by descent, are the posterity of those ancient Bohemian brethren. They declare, further, that they do not differ from the Lutherans in regard to doctrines, but only in their customs and regulations, in which they come near to the ancient Bohemians. But many question whether they here assert the truth; and are suspicious that these new brethren adopt the language of the

Lutherans while among the Lutherans, the more readily to obtain toleration; and that in reality they are a mixture of people of various characters and sentiments. However this may be, it is at least difficult to understand why they are so zealous to extend their particular sect, if they differ from us only in their customs and mode of discipline. For whoever truly follows *Jesus Christ*, will care little how the Christian community is constituted and regulated; because he knows that religion does not consist in external rites and regulations, but in faith and love.¹

§ 18. This progress of superstition among us, as many supposed, nothing could arrest except philosophy. And hence the cultivation of philosophy, which was apparently neglected towards the close of the preceding century, has not only been revived, but also prosecuted by many with great diligence. The general method of philosophizing, which I have called the *metaphysical*, obtained preference before all others. This, the superlative genius of *Godfrey William von Leibnitz* elucidated elegantly, and cast into a better shape: but it was the very acute *Christopher Wolf* who perfected it, digested it into a system, and—what was entirely a new thing, and never before attempted—gave it the form of a mathematical science. In this improved state, most of those who searched after truth and certainty were exceedingly captivated with it, and eagerly applied it to the explanation and confirmation of the truths of revealed religion. But this gave very great dissatisfaction to many good men, who were anxious for the safety of the truth taught us by Christ: and hence the old conflict between philosophy and theology, piety and reason, was revived, and was urged on with great vehemence for a series of years. For many are of opinion, that this metaphysical philosophy imbues the minds of young men with sentiments hostile to all religion and religious worship, with arrogance also, contempt for divine revelation, excessive confidence in human reason,

¹ [The modern Moravians or United Brethren claim a descent from the United Brethren of the sixteenth century. See above, cent. xvi. sect. iii. pt. ii. c. ii. § 24. Their church was revived at the beginning of the eighteenth century, by the exertions of Christian David, the two Neissers, and count Zinzendorf, who established them at Herrnhuth in 1722. Zinzendorf next visited the different countries of Europe, and tried to create an interest in his pious fraternity. In 1734, the society founded a mission in Greenland, and soon after extended their operations to the West Indies, the Cape of Good Hope, Ceylon, and Inner Asia. They were accused, in the middle of the century, of the same excesses which were imputed to other Pietistic schools in Germany, but vindicated themselves. In consequence, however, of the risk they incurred by these charges in England, they sought the protection of the legislature in 1747, and obtained an act of parliament which legalised them and

protected their missions in the colonies. Zinzendorf died in 1760. The brethren have no confession of faith, but admit the Augsburg Confession. Their government is episcopal; and their orders are said to be derived from a Waldensian source. They are chiefly known by their missionary work, their hymns, and their schools. These last are famous both in Germany and in England: in the former as nurseries of Pietism, in England as well-managed establishments. In 1851, their numbers were about 12,000 in Europe and 6,000 in America: their chapels in England were 32, with 9,305 sittings. They had 70 missionary settlements, 294 missionaries, and 69,149 confirmed converts in the missionary congregations. Their funds, about 13,000*l.* a year, are raised in great measure among English churchmen. See Marsden's *Christian Churches*, i. 100; and the Census on Religious Worship, of 1851. *Ed.*]

and other vices; and that it does not throw light and dignity around theology, but rather darkness and ignominy.

§ 19. In proof of the correctness of this opinion respecting the tendency of this philosophy, they appeal especially to the case of *Lawrence Schmidt*, of Schweinfurt, who is commonly called the *Wertheim translator*, from the place where he resided. This man, by no means destitute of abilities, and very well versed in the philosophy in question, projected a new German translation of the Bible, to serve as the foundation or basis of a new body of divinity drawn up according to the strict rules of demonstration, which he had in contemplation. But the project was disastrous to him. For scarcely had he published a specimen of the work, in a translation of the inspired books of Moses, when he was not only attacked in numerous publications, but was likewise accused before the supreme tribunal of the Germanic empire, as a capital enemy of the Christian religion, and a caviller at divine truth. The chief ground of accusation was, that he had boldly construed certain passages in the books of Moses, which designated or foretold the coming of Messiah, in such a manner as to give them a different signification. He was therefore thrown into prison, and ordered to be tried for his life. But he escaped from prison, and saved himself by flight.

§ 20. The controversies and contentions of this age have been very numerous. First, what is called the *Pietistic* controversy has been carried on in some places more fiercely, and in others more moderately, according to the varying state of personal and local causes. But the controversy has gradually abated as time rolled on, and at present seems to be reduced nearly to the single point, whether an irreligious man may have true and certain knowledge of divine things, or some sort of illumination, which many regard as a contest about words rather than things. Besides this, there have been several other controversies, which also produced excitement in the preceding century, respecting the eternity of the torments of the damned, the final restoration of all things, Christ's [millennial] reign on the earth, and others of like character. With *John Fabricius*, a divine of Helmstadt, and some others, there has been a dispute respecting the importance of the disagreement between us and the papists: for he and his associates deemed it not so great as it is commonly supposed to be; so that he believed a person might lawfully go over to the Roman church. Respecting the law of marriage, the grounds of divorce, and concubinage, there have been great disputes between certain theologians and some distinguished jurists. Minor contests, which suddenly spring up, and soon die away, as they contribute little to a knowledge of the internal state of the church, need not be enumerated.

§ 21. The Reformed church not only preserves the same aspect that was above described, but also studies to make it still more her appropriate characteristic.¹ For notwithstanding that the formulas

¹ [Mosheim still continues to speak of all those who are styled *Reformed*, as if they
VOL. III. I I

of faith, which the vigilance of a former age provided for enclosing and fortifying religion, remain everywhere the same, yet, in most countries, no preacher is compelled to think in exact accordance with them, but is supposed to fulfil his duty if he hold up the great and primary truths of Christianity, and avoid too much familiarity with the papists and Socinians. Hence in this very ample community, at the present day, Arminians, Supralapsarians, Infralapsarians, and Universalists,¹ live amicably together, and with united efforts strive to extenuate and lessen the importance of those contests that divide the Christians who have separated themselves from the Romish communion. There are indeed some, especially among the Swiss, the Germans, and the Dutch, who are greatly troubled at this moderation, and deplore bitterly the loss of former purity and rigour, and occasionally grow warm and attack despisers of the ancient discipline. But the others, who are greatly superior in numbers, respectability, and power, care little for this angry feeling.

§ 22. Whoever, therefore, duly considers the whole subject, must freely acknowledge, that neither the Lutherans nor the Arminians have any longer ground for controversy with the Reformed church, but only with individual doctors of this family. For this church leaves every one at liberty to think as he pleases on those points which were formerly the ground of its separation from the Lutherans and Arminians, and deems the fundamentals of religion safe, however those points are explained. And yet this very moderation thwarts the designs of such as would effect a union between the Lutherans and the Reformed. For those among us who are strenuous for orthodoxy, complain, that the Reformed open the door of salvation too widely, and that they offer communion and friendship not only to *us*, but to all the sectarians. When, therefore, about twenty years ago,² certain excellent men among us (at the head of whom was *Christopher Matth. Pfaff*, a man on many accounts venerated and renowned) took very great pains to effect a union between us and the Reformed, the majority [of the Lutherans] so vigorously opposed the object, both by action and by publications, that it was soon abandoned.

§ 23. The English church, which holds the first rank among the Reformed, is the same now that it was in the time of *William III.* The *Episcopalians* are the reigning party, and number among their adherents the king himself, with the nobility of the realm, and the greatest part of the people. But toleration is granted to the *Puritans* or *Presbyterians*, and to all the others who are included under the very comprehensive appellation of *Nonconformists*. Those, however, who are particularly acquainted with English affairs tell us, that the

were united in *one church* or religious community, while, in fact, they form a number of totally distinct communities, often differing widely in doctrine, discipline, and worship, and in several instances having no sort of communion with each other. And hence

his remarks respecting them, as a body, are liable to much criticism. *Tr.*

¹ [*i. e.* Believers in a universal atonement. *Tr.*]

² [Thus wrote Mosheim in 1741. The precise year of Pfaff's attempts for a union was 1719. *Schl.*]

Nonconformists diminish continually, and that this gradual diminution is ascribable to the mildness and gentleness of the bishops towards them. The *Episcopalians* are of two sorts. Some believe the government by bishops to be of divine institution; and they exalt and magnify immoderately the prerogatives of the church. Others are more temperate; and though they fully believe that an ecclesiastical government by bishops is more holy and more perfect than any other, and think that great care should be taken to prevent the clergy from becoming subject to the will and authority of kings and magistrates, yet they do not think the name of a *church* is improperly applied to a community in which there are no bishops; and they are temperate in defending the prerogatives of prelates among Christians.¹ These two parties are sometimes engaged in sharp contests; a striking example of which occurred in the present century; for the present bishop of Winchester, *Benjamin Hoadly*, a man eminent for talents and eloquence, greatly lowered down the authority of the church, that is, of its presiding officers, and confined it within narrower limits. On the other hand, *John Potter*, now archbishop of Canterbury, and at the head of the British clergy, and others, contended for the prerogatives and authority of the church, with great eloquence and erudition. Moreover, the disposition of the established church of England towards those who dissent from it, cannot be learned from anything more exactly than from the fact that *William Wake*, the late archbishop of Canterbury, a few years ago, was disposed to form an alliance with the French church, on terms which would secure to both most of their respective peculiarities of sentiment.²

§ 24. The unbounded liberty which Englishmen enjoy of publishing their opinions without restraint, and of worshipping God in the manner that each one thinks right, naturally causes various sects to arise on every side, and controversies respecting things pertaining to religion to be perpetual. But it is hardly possible for any one, who has not himself lived some time in England, and on the spot formed acquaintance with the opinions, privileges, laws, and parties of that happy nation, to give a full and accurate account of these different sects and controversies. Of several of the sects, not even the names reach us; and of many of them, we have only a species of knowledge,

¹ ['The learned and pious archbishop Wake, in a letter to father Courayer, dated from Croydon House, July 9, 1724, expresseth himself thus: "I bless God that I was born and have been bred in an episcopal church; which I am convinced has been the government established in the Christian church from the very times of the Apostles. But I should be unwilling to affirm, that where the ministry is not episcopal, there is *no church*, nor any *true* administration of the sacraments. And very many there are among us, who are zealous for episcopacy, and yet dare not go so far as to annul the ordinances of God performed by any other

ministry."'] *Macl.*

² ['This assertion of Dr. Mosheim is altogether unfounded; for archbishop Wake, as appears from authentic letters, since published by Dr. Maclaine, was not the first mover in this business: nor did he ever offer to concede *one* point in the doctrine or discipline of the church of England, in order to promote the union between the Gallican and English churches.' (Note to *A Summary of Mosheim's Eccl. Hist.*, by the Rev. C. Trelawney Collins, Lond. 1822, ii. 187.) For the particulars of this negotiation of abp. Wake, see the letters between him and Du Pin, in the Appendix. *S.*]

which is quite imperfect and indistinct. Of the controversies, to a great extent, we are unable to ascertain the true foundation and the points at issue, because we are destitute of the sources from which information can be drawn. At this present time, one *George Whitefield* is collecting a party, and contemplates the formation of a Christian community, more perfect than all others; nor is he altogether unsuccessful. It would seem, if the man be self-consistent, and do not follow the blind impulse of fancy rather than any determinate rule, that he places religion altogether in holy emotions, and an indescribable kind of sensation; and that he requires his followers to dismiss all reliance on reason and study as means of [religious] knowledge, and to resign up their minds to be guided and instructed by a divine illumination.

§ 25. The Dutch, quite down to our times, have been occupied with the Cocceian and Cartesian controversies, though now less intensely than heretofore. And there is a prospect that these contests will wholly cease, since the Newtonian mode of philosophizing has expelled the Cartesian from the Dutch universities. Of the Roëllian disputes, we have already given an account. *Frederick van Leenhof*, in the year 1703, fell under suspicion of being a Spinozist; and was attacked by many on account of a book he published, entitled *Heaven upon Earth*,¹ in which he taught that a Christian should always be joyful, and never mourn or be sorrowful. The same crime was charged by many upon *William Deurhof*, who published several tracts in the vernacular tongue, in which he speculated concerning the Divine nature, as if he considered it an *energy* pervading the whole material universe, and operative in all parts of it. The most recent contests are those of *James Saurin* and *Paul Maty*. The former, a minister of the gospel at the Hague, and distinguished for his genius and eloquence, if he erred at all, erred very slightly. For, if we except a few inaccurate and unwary expressions, he deviated from the common doctrine only in this one point, that he thought it sometimes lawful to deceive men by our speech, for the sake of accomplishing some great good.² Most of the Reformed churches, it is to be noted, have adopted the principle of *Augustine*, that every deception and every falsehood is sinful. The other, namely *Maty*, committed a much greater fault; for in order to explain the profound mystery of three persons in one God, and to render it easy to be understood, he assumed that the Son and the Holy Spirit are two finite beings, created by God, who at a certain time became united to God.³

§ 26. In Switzerland, especially in the canton of Bern, the *Formula Consensus*, of which we have spoken before, has produced very

¹ *Cælum in Terris.*

² [See Saurin's *Discours Historiques, Théologiques, Critiques, et Moraux, sur les évènements les plus mémorables du Vieux et du Nouveau Testament*, tom. i. of the folio edition.] *Macl.*]

³ [See Dr. Mosheim's *Historia Critica novæ explanationis Dogmatis de tribus in Deo personis, quam vir clariss. Paulus Maty excogitavit*: in his *Dissertt. ad Historiam Eccles. pertinentes*, tom. ii. pp. 390—582. *Tr.*]

fierce disputes. In the year 1718 the magistrates of Bern required all public teachers, and particularly those of the university and church of Lausanne (in whom there was supposed to be some stain of error), to assent to this *Formula*, and to receive it as the standard of their faith; for it had been a good while neglected, and subscription to it had not in all cases been required. But several, both of the professors and of the candidates for the sacred office, declared that they could not conscientiously subscribe; and accordingly some of them were subjected to punishment. This caused grievous contentions and complaints, to quiet which, the king of Great Britain and the States-General of Holland offered their kind offices. The result was, that the *Formula* lost much of its credit and authority. In the German [Reformed] churches nothing very noticeable has occurred. The Palatine church, once so very flourishing, has suffered, through the machinations of the papists, a great diminution of its prosperity.

§ 27. The Socinians, dispersed over various countries of Europe, have hitherto nowhere¹ obtained liberty to form themselves into a regular community, and publicly to set up worship according to the views of their sect. At the head of their learned men in our times stood *Samuel Crell*, who died at an advanced age at Amsterdam. He chose, however, to be called an *Artemonite*, rather than a Socinian: and he actually differed on many points from the common doctrines of the Socinians. The Arians obtained a great advocate in *William Whiston*, a professor [of mathematics] in the university of Cambridge, who made up his mind rather to resign his chair than to renounce his opinions, which he defended in numerous publications. Similar to him, according to the common estimation, was *Samuel Clarke*, a man richly endowed with powers of genius and education, who in the year 1724 was condemned for adulterating the sound doctrine in regard to three persons in the Godhead. But no ingenuous and reasonable man will rank *Dr. Clarke* among the Arians, if this name is to be taken in its native and proper acceptation; for he merely defended, with greater clearness and diligence, what is called the Arminian *subordination*, which has been and is still embraced by so many of the first men, and by very learned prelates, in England; and taught, that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are in *nature* equal, but in *rank* unequal.² A great number of persons among the English have endeavoured, in various ways, to invalidate and assail the most sacred doctrine of the divine Trinity. And this induced an opulent lady, whose name was *Moyer*, to leave by her will a rich legacy,³ as a premium for eight public discourses, to be delivered annually by some learned man, in opposition to this species of

¹ [Except in Transylvania. *Schl.*]

² [Dr. Mosheim has here mistaken the true hypothesis of Dr. Clarke, or, at least, expressed it imperfectly; for what he says here is rather applicable to the opinion of Dr. Waterland. Dr. Clarke maintained an

equality of perfections between the three Persons, but a *subordination of nature* in point of existence and derivation. *Macl.*]

³ [It was an estate, holden under a lease which expired long ago. *S.*]

impiety. The institution has been in operation since the year 1720, and promises to future ages a rich collection of the best productions in defence of this part of revealed religion.

* CHAPTER II.

§ 1. Events disadvantageous to Romanism — § 2. Expulsion of the Jesuits from Portugal — § 3. Their order suppressed in France — § 4. Regularly suppressed by the Pope — § 5. Still patronised by Prussia and Russia — § 6. Reforms of the emperor Joseph II. — § 7. Reforms in Tuscany — § 8. Decline of Romanism in France — § 9. Overthrow of all religion there — § 10. Reaction in its favour — § 11. Ruin of the Pope's temporal power — § 12. English intolerance to Protestants ended under George I. — § 13. The convocation reduced to inactivity — § 14. Prevalence of infidelity and licentiousness — § 15. Wesley and the Arminian Methodists — § 16. Whitefield and the Calvinistic Methodists — § 17. Differences between the two leaders — § 18. The countess of Huntingdon — § 19. Rise of an anti-Trinitarian sect in England — § 20. Application to Parliament for relief from subscription — § 21. This granted to dissenting ministers — § 22. Attempt at a comprehension — § 23. Ineffectual applications for a repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts — § 24. English Romanists relieved from some of the severest penal enactments — § 25. Toleration granted to them — § 26. Relief granted to Irish Romanists — § 27. And to the Scottish — § 28. Relief granted to Scottish Protestant Episcopalians — § 29. The American church — § 30. The Dissidents and the partition of Poland.

§ 1. As the eighteenth century advanced, Romanism appeared nodding to its fall. It was first seriously threatened by the prevalence of Jansenistic views, which struck at papal authority, and introduced various habits of thinking analogous to those of Protestants. Even the empress queen Maria Theresa, though zealously attached to Romish opinions, gave them a severe blow in the Austrian dominions, about the year 1753, by bestowing her confidence upon Van Swieten and De Haen, two physicians, who were members of the Jansenistic church at Utrecht. University professorships were quickly filled by men of similar principles; and schemes of ecclesiastical reform were far from slow in courting notice from the Austrian public. The monastic bodies were marked out for diminution, their exemptions from episcopal authority were said to demand abolition, the established intercourse with Rome was blamed as excessive, and it was proposed to place the church really under the control of the state.¹ Under all such attacks, the papal see had long found effectual means of resistance in the Jesuits, but Loyola's order was very much fallen in public estimation. Jansenism had rendered it unpopular in the more pious Romish circles; politicians complained of its encroaching spirit; and an infidel school, now rising to irresistible importance in France, fastened upon Jesuitism with peculiar severity, because it was a main

* By MR. SOAMES.

¹ *Continuation of the Summary of Mosheim*, by the Rev. C. T. Collins, ii. 193.

prop of the existing religious establishment. This hateful school may date its origin from the reign of Lewis XIV., when Bayle, with some other men of talent, assumed a freedom and levity in treating serious subjects, that undermined the strength of many prepossessions hitherto thought wholly above assault. The habit of implicit credence being thus broken, Frenchmen turned a scrutinising eye upon the Roman church, and confounding its palpable weaknesses with Christianity itself, the country became overspread with an obstinate, scoffing contempt for revelation altogether. Its most active defenders, the Jesuits, naturally fell under a great load of obloquy. They were, however, befriended by many influential ecclesiastics, not only on account of their services against infidelity, but also for their active and uncompromising hostility to Jansenism. For the purpose of discouraging Huguenot opinions, a practice had prevailed, and with approbation, to deny the last sacraments, when the party seeking them could not produce a certificate of confession signed by an orthodox priest. A clergyman extended this principle to Jansenism, for which he was fined by the parliament of Paris. That court also, in the year 1752, issued a prohibition against all acts tending to schism, and all refusal of sacraments, under colour of obedience to the bull *Unigenitus*. The archbishop of Paris, De Beaumont, a virtuous but narrow-minded man, maintained the propriety of giving to that bull all the force against Jansenism for which it was intended; and the king, Lewis XV., found himself imperiously called upon to interfere. By the advice of Lamoignon, the chancellor, he submitted the points in dispute to deputies from both the contending parties: but this expedient only caused further irritation. The parliament would not recede from the principle of prosecuting priests who withheld the sacraments, and met a royal order for the discontinuance of all such processes by a warm remonstrance. Lewis now dispersed and exiled the refractory members; but he found public opinion so decidedly in their favour, that he soon recalled them. The archbishop of Paris was next banished from the capital, for keeping the dispute alive; and a council was called in 1755, for the purpose of settling the question. This body applied to the pope, and he wrote an equivocal letter to the king, throwing upon him the decision. Lewis at length held one of those despotic sessions, called *a bed of justice*, and by this, in connexion with another arbitrary exercise of power, he so disgusted the parliament, that it refused any longer to exercise its functions. The Jesuits were highly elated by the seeming triumph thus gained for them by despotism. It was however fatal to their order in France, the nation being now fully persuaded that its influence was quite incompatible with any substantial amelioration of public institutions.¹

§ 2. In Portugal, the Jesuits were grown even still more obnoxious. They had long possessed great power in that country, but the leading men were become weary of it, from its vexatious interference with every

¹ *Continuation of Mosheim*, by Charles Coote, LL.D., Lond. 1826.

public transaction. The reigning monarch, Joseph I., especially, was anxious to emancipate himself and his people from a control which left free agency to neither. As a necessary consequence, he was detested by the order; and when some disappointed nobles conspired against his life, three Jesuits, of whom Malagrida is the one most remembered, acted as confessors, and suggested sophistical encouragement to the guilty parties.¹ Joseph had a very narrow escape, on the 3rd of September, 1758, and his hatred of the Jesuits now knew no bounds. He suppressed their colleges, accused the order of usurping an authority and using an influence in Paraguay,² highly prejudicial to the interests of both Portugal and Spain, and would not rest until it was wholly rooted out from his dominions. In 1759, accordingly, all Jesuits were declared outlaws, and banished from the Portuguese territories: an example which was pressed upon the imitation of other courts.³

§ 3. In France, the parliament, when reinstated, proved as resolute as ever in prosecuting priests who denied the sacraments, and was keenly upon the watch to ruin effectually that order which had exulted so indiscreetly on the late temporary ascendancy given to it by force of despotism. The desired opportunity came, from one of those commercial transactions which Jesuitism took within its universal range. A mercantile firm at Marseilles, which La Valette, superior of the Leeward Islands' mission, had engaged to supply with colonial produce, stopped payment, on the seizure of a cargo by British cruisers. As La Valette's transactions had long been enormous, the house was under very heavy acceptances to him, and means of meeting them being thus unexpectedly intercepted, it sent urgent applications for assistance to the heads of the Jesuitic body. This happened most inconveniently to be without a general, that officer having died just before, and consequently when prompt measures were urgently required, nothing could be done. A successor was, however, no sooner found, than orders were given to supply the tottering firm with such money as was needed. But when advices to this effect reached Marseilles, the house had already stopped payment, and a panic seizing its numerous creditors, they crowded with claims upon the order. The Jesuits now seemed bereft of their usual tact. With equal imprudence and injustice, they disavowed La Valette's transactions, and upon various grounds treated him as a mere individual trader.⁴ This representation was, however, scouted as nothing better than a dishonest subterfuge,—the trade of Jesuitism, like every other undertaking within the order, being treated as really under the direction of its head, who was, therefore, with all his inferiors, responsible for commercial payments, and, in fact, for every public movement made by a Jesuit. No other view, it was pleaded, could be taken by any who knew the constitutions of the order. The

¹ 'They decided that conspirators would incur a *venial* sin, and not a *mortal* one.'—*History of the Jesuits*, Lond. 1816, i. 347.

² *Ibid.* 346.

³ Coote, 222.

⁴ Gifford's *Hist. of France*, iv. 678.

Jesuits denying this, received a mandate, in 1761, to produce their documents. Having done so, a merciless exposure of their order followed. It was now generally viewed as a combination of the most dangerous kind, blindly moving, with an admirable machinery, at the discretion of a foreigner, and a small council of artful assistants. These views being warmly pressed upon the king, he proposed to the general a plan for regulating the order. This was, however, declined; and, in consequence, the parliament ordained, in 1762, that French Jesuits should lay aside the habit of their order, cease to live in societies, and to obey alien superiors. In some quarters, a violent clamour was raised against this ordonnance, as founded upon *ex-parte* statements, which were, in fact, untrue. But the French nation was not affected by any such demonstrations; and in 1764, the order was suppressed, by the parliaments of Paris, Normandy, and Brittany. The pope vainly interposed his authority against the assumption of such a power by tribunals merely lay; his bull was suppressed in France, by a parliamentary decree; in Portugal, the king was bold enough to declare it inoperative.¹

§ 4. Spain would not be behind other Romish countries in the war against Jesuitism. In 1767, the temporalities of the order in that country were seized, and the members of it banished.² Vainly, however, did the Romish powers press for a papal dissolution of the obnoxious body. While Clement XIII. lived, it had a protection upon which it could securely depend. His successor, the celebrated Francis Laurence Ganganelli, a Franciscan friar, proved more tractable: he took the name of Clement XIV., and became known, from the enlightened liberality of his sentiments, as *the Protestant pope*. But although ready, above most of his predecessors, to consider fully any question proposed to him, he was not willing to take so decided a step as the suppression of the most influential religious order in existence, without mature deliberation. When, accordingly, powerful courts earnestly recommended the suppression of Jesuitism, Ganganelli did not suffer himself to be betrayed into any unjust and impolitic haste; he took four years for deliberation, referred the question to a commission instituted for inquiry, considered everything said both for and against the society, and read every important publication on both sides.³ At length he came to a conviction, that the Romish world, in the wish that it had generally expressed for the extinction of the Jesuitic order, was perfectly right. Accordingly, in 1773, he suppressed that celebrated society, as not only no longer answering the ends of its institution, but also blemished both by principles and practices of an injurious tendency.⁴ The Jesuits were violently enraged by this sentence of annihilation; and Laurence Ricci, their general, after a confinement in the English college, occasioned such a ferment among his partisans, that he was committed to the castle of

¹ Coote, 224.

² 'In the year 1766, their expulsion took place from Bohemia and Denmark; in 1767, from Spain, Venice, and Genoa; and in

1768, from Naples, Malta, and Parma.'—Collins, 195.

³ *Hist. of the Jesuits*, i. 266.

⁴ Coote, 227.

St. Angelo by the congregation of cardinals. He died in that fortress, after undergoing many examinations, in November, 1775.¹ The pope himself felt his act likely to bring an untimely death upon him; and this apprehension has been considered as verified by the event. He lived, however, in tranquillity and health more than eight months after the society was abolished; still, not without occasional apprehensions of the vengeance which he knew himself to have provoked. But he said, that if it were his lot to become a victim, he should be a willing one, being perfectly satisfied that his act was not only just, but even also necessary; and that it had not been determined upon without fervent prayers both from himself and others interested in his welfare. His mortal illness seized him one day after dinner, in the Passion Week of 1774, and it continued, with various degrees of intensity, until the 22nd of the following September, when he died. After death, his corpse rapidly became excessively discoloured and offensive; which circumstances, taken in connexion with the firm health that he had enjoyed up to the time of his seizure, and the exasperation of the Jesuits, made people consider him to have been poisoned. To account for the accomplishment of this in a manner so gradual, the mischief was attributed to the *acquetta*, a deadly Calabrian drug, said to have the property of destroying life in a lingering way.² Salicetti, an eminent physician, did, indeed, refer his death to natural causes; and the disbelief of slow poisons, which has gained ground with the increase of knowledge, is now highly favourable to the admission of such a view. But contemporaries commonly rejected it with contempt, and attributed Salicetti's report to corruption.³

§ 5. After the suppression of their order by that authority which it professes to regard with slavish obedience, and its expulsion from Romish countries, the Jesuits found a refuge in states which cared nothing for papal authority. Russia and Prussia became their protectors. The latter government patronised them as useful to its Romish subjects, declaring that no attention could be paid, at the court of Berliu, to papal bulls, when they seemed likely to compromise the welfare of individuals within the Prussian states. In the Russian empire, the Jesuits were publicly patronised by the bishop of Mohileff, once a Calvinist, but who now professed Romanism with all the ardour of a proselyte, and well knew how useful a well-organised combination, with its diversified machinery, and elastic conscience, must be in maintaining and spreading his new system of belief. By this prelate's means, the Jesuits were regularly embodied in White Russia; and when the Spanish court remonstrated, the empress Catharine not only repelled its interference as a foreign dic-

¹ *Memoirs of Scipio de Ricci*, Lond. 1829, i. 8, 28.

² *Circumstantial Narrative detailing the last illness and death of Pope Clement XIV.*, sent by the Spanish minister to his court. *Ibid.*

³ *Hist. of the Jesuits*, i. 267. The writer

treats the attack in April as distinct from that which carried Ganganelli off: hence he considers that two attempts were made to poison him. But the Spanish minister's narrative is against this hypothesis; making it plain, that the attack in April was the first step in a continuous illness.

tation, but even allowed a vicar-general of the Jesuits to be chosen among her subjects, and invested with the privileges which such a superior had usually enjoyed. She admitted that grounds of exception existed against the Jesuits, but denied that a sufficient case had been made out for the great severity with which they had recently been treated.¹

§ 6. But although governments hostile to the papal church were thus blindly bent upon nursing the discomfited remnant of her most effective defenders, within her own pale she continually found fresh grounds for uneasiness. The German emperor, Joseph II., who succeeded his mother, Maria Theresa, in 1780, speedily began upon a series of ecclesiastical reforms in the Austrian states. They were so obviously needful, that even the late empress had contemplated some of them; but notwithstanding, Joseph's ecclesiastical policy was highly unpalatable to the court of Rome. His outward adherence to the Romish communion was never discontinued, but he really cared little or nothing for doctrinal questions, and was quite willing to let his subjects enjoy all their old opinions, and many of their old superstitions, if he could only increase his own power at the expense of the church. He began by imposing restrictions upon bulls and rescripts from Rome. He then exempted monasteries and missionary colleges from obedience to superiors at the papal court, forbade the remittance of money into foreign countries for masses, and the solicitation of dignities at Rome without his permission. He even ordered the discontinuance of pilgrimages, and a diminution of images and ornaments in churches. He granted, besides, a free toleration both to Protestants and members of the Greek church; nor did he hesitate to dissolve a great number of monasteries, converting their buildings into colleges, hospitals, or barracks. Monks, for the future, were only to exist in such numbers as could be usefully employed in pastoral or educational duties. Mendicant friars were altogether suppressed. Some of them were pensioned, but none allowed to levy contributions on the public as heretofore. An immense mass of property was obtained from this extensive interference with monachism, but it was properly saved from the rapacity of private families. A portion of it, being connected with mines and manufactures, was reserved for the civil government; the rest was made into a fund for the maintenance of religious and educational establishments. Besides taking these liberties with ecclesiastical institutions, Joseph even placed his reforming hand upon the church service. The communion office, or mass, he left untouched, but all the more social portions of religious worship he directed to be said in German; a rational innovation, by which Austria still is advantageously distinguished from other Romish countries.² The pope was further outraged, by a claim to the patronage of bishoprics and other benefices in the Italian states of Austria.³ John Angelo Braschi, under the designation of Pius VI., now occupied Ganganelli's place. He was a vain man, of no great depth, and he fancied that a

¹ Coote, 230.

² Turnbull's *Austria*, ii. 81.

³ Coote, 234.

personal interview with Joseph might arrest his obnoxious projects. To the surprise, therefore, of Europe, and against better judgments than his own, he made light of his advanced age, and undertook a journey to Vienna. He was received with great courtesy there, but very closely watched, and found himself utterly incapable of making any impression upon the innovating emperor, who professed himself a thorough Catholic at heart, but, at the same time, quite resolved upon exercising the rights of a sovereign to make such reforms among his clergy, both secular and regular, as were urgently required. Pius returned home deeply mortified; and his annoyance was increased by the levity displayed at Rome, where the people were amused by their old sovereign's fruitless errand, however they might really be interested in its success.¹ Joseph's example was not lost upon other Romish countries; even Spain and Portugal showed symptoms of awakening from the deep papal lethargy which had long weighed them down. The cabinet of Madrid claimed privileges analogous to those of the Gallican church, and reduced the Inquisition to a mere engine of political oppression. The court of Lisbon authorised publications encouraging such free inquiry as did not interfere with the religious principles of Romanism, and placed restrictions upon the taking of monastic vows. Naples and Venice, too, suppressed many monasteries.² Thus a general spirit of revolt arose throughout the papal world.

§ 7. The emperor Joseph's brother, and eventual successor, Leopold, who was originally placed on the grand-ducal throne of Tuscany, preceded him in attacking the abuses of Romanism there. So early as the year 1770, he caused a collection to be made and published, exposing the weak parts of the papal system. In this were exhibited, among other matters equally unsatisfactory to the dominant church, the steps by which papal power has been established. Tuscany was invited to consider the transfer of the imperial court from Rome to Constantinople, the Roman bishop's adroit improvement of the iconoclastic reaction, and his legitimation of the Carlovingian kings on the throne of France.³ All these, indeed, are trite historical facts, but they are little known to the mass of men, and they tend to account for papal greatness in a manner injurious to its hold upon the religious feelings of mankind. Subsequently, Leopold abolished the inviolability of those numerous asylums which the churches of his country afforded, encouraging the vicious in crimes, and rendering them almost careless of detection. Officers of justice were allowed to drag offenders from these privileged places, but their sanctity was still so far respected, as to entitle criminals to a lower punishment than they would have undergone, if captured under ordinary circumstances.⁴ Attempts were also made to wean the people from some of the grosser superstitions. A violent clamour was raised against these obvious advances to social improvement, both at Rome and else-

¹ Collins, 202.

² Coote, 235.

³ *Memoirs of Scipio de Ricci*, i. 273.

⁴ *Ibid.* 74.

where. Leopold was compared to Henry VIII., and his principal ecclesiastical adviser, Scipio de Ricci, bishop of Pistoia and Prato, was denounced as a manifest heretic.¹ The grand duke, however, stood immoveably to his purpose, rendering the clergy liable to the same taxation as other men;² taking measures for securing the independence of his church upon Rome, or any other foreign authority; restraining females of tender age from binding themselves by monastic vows; diminishing church pageantry; suppressing the Inquisition; preventing spiritual courts from trying laymen; bringing the clergy under the civil jurisdiction, when charged with ordinary offences; and leaving to ecclesiastical tribunals no cognisance of causes not strictly connected with religion.³

§ 8. But Rome soon found matter for more serious and indignant reflexion, than any likely to be afforded by princes who professed a respect for her communion, while they sought additional power at her expense, and an elevation of their subjects above her baser superstitions. In France, it seemed, at one time, as if no terms of any kind would again be made with popery. The church of that country was very wealthy, possessing, besides tithes, nearly half of the land,⁴ and hence had become a mark for that envy which narrow circumstances naturally engender in the great mass of men, and which was daily becoming more intense, especially after the popular infusion that flowed from the assistance given to the revolted colonies of British North America. The church had lost also much of its hold upon the superior classes of society, from the general prevalence of a scoffing infidel spirit, which would hear of no reform in the national religion; considering its base pagan alloy as an integral part of Christianity itself; and that, consequently, the whole system was one grand imposture, which a Lucian or a Voltaire might fitly ridicule, and which an enlightened age was bound to overthrow. Even the inferior clergy were very little of a counterpoise to this growing mass of irreligious prejudice. They were, indeed, highly respected generally among their poor parishioners, to whom they rendered every service in their power, and the best instruction that error grafted upon truth allowed. They had, however, rather a loose degree of attachment for the ecclesiastical institutions of their country as a whole. Their own circumstances were generally straitened; those of their superiors the reverse. Now men will commonly bear this inequality with tolerable patience, under the buoyancy of hope, when the wealth or splendour in sight may also be within reach. But this alleviation of his narrow lot was hardly open to the humble French ecclesiastic, however sanguine might be his temperament. It is true, that the excessive advantages of birth, which really were the cancer of France before the revolution, did not theoretically operate upon the church. Any one of her sons might rise to the highest dignities; and occasionally such a fortunate individual started from inferior life. But, practically, there was little or

¹ *Mem. of Scipio de Ricci*, 158.

² *Ibid.* 172.

³ *Ibid.* 220.

⁴ Alison's *French Revol.* i. 76, Edinb. 1833.

no hope of this. The ecclesiastical grandee was nearly always the kinsman or near connexion of lay grantees: by their influence he had gained his easy and splendid position; in their society, and with their habits, he spent his time; he was, in fact, a man of fashion, no less than they, though with more learning, and some external differences; and he naturally nurtured all that insolent consciousness of belonging to a *caste* indefeasibly superior, which the higher French inherited from the long and jealous possession of exclusive, unjust, irritating privileges. The inferior clergyman was thus kept at a galling distance from the more fortunate members of his own profession; and feeling hardly anything in common with them, he readily took the same views of their pretensions and position, that were gaining ground every day as to those of the lay aristocracy. Hence it happened, that when the long-branded and excluded classes began to clamour with a voice of thunder for the rights of merit without hereditary advantages, the parochial clergy generally were found among the assailing party.¹ Upon the personal merits of the superior clergy, very different impressions have prevailed; some representing them as generally vicious, others as far from unworthy of their profession. Most probably, the latter was their preponderating character, however it may have been kept out of sight during the storms of the revolution, which was little disposed to an acknowledgment of merit in any wealthy quarter, but least of all in opulent and aristocratic ecclesiastics.

§ 9. While France was preparing for that meeting of the *States-General* which revolutionised the country, the clergy, as might be expected, immediately split into two parties, with all the elements of mutual repulsion. Deputies were chosen, by the prelacy, with aristocratic views; by the great body of ecclesiastics, with democratic. To these latter delegates, as to the others from inferior life, an undue weight was impolitically given by Neckar, whose infatuation augmented the dangerous rapidity of popular motion, by doubling the deputies from the Third Estate. None felt more keenly the alteration thus given to their position than the higher clergy, who looked with deep suspicion upon the number of parochial ministers and the like, who joined their muster, when the *States* met, in May, 1789.² Some of them, however, headed the great body of lower clerical deputies, who madly joined the lay Third Estate, on the 22nd of June, and thus gave it a constitutional weight which before was wanting.³ Nothing could show more undeniably the little sympathy, even with their own superiors, which had flowed from a long course of neglect and exclusion, than this rash movement of the parochial clergy. It sealed the fate of the monarchy, and, with it, of the church. In the following August, it was proposed to commute tithes into a money payment; three days afterwards, they were abolished on a vague understanding that religion should be adequately provided for in another way: a prospect that proved illusory, as, probably, those most active in the

¹ Alison, 110.

² *Ibid.* 127.

³ *Ibid.* 141.

abolition meant that it should.¹ Within a few months afterwards,² the immense landed estates of the church were confiscated, for the purpose of relieving the financial embarrassments of the country, and clergymen were made public stipendiaries. As usual, however, the compensation given bore a strange disproportion to the property seized: about one-fifth of their former incomes was all that the government proposed to allow,³ and the opulent ecclesiastics of France were thus reduced at once to a lower station than was rightfully their own, and than the interests of religion really required. It is, indeed, easy to say, and such sayings are eagerly applauded by the selfish and envious majority of mankind, that ecclesiastics will never want their due influence in society, unless wanting to themselves. Such seeming truisms are, however, liable to that charge of error which seldom fails to lurk in abstract generalities: the truth is, that high qualifications, manly independence of sentiment, and sufficient influence over society, cannot be secured to the clergy any more than to other men, unless there is a considerable infusion among them of that pecuniary ease which allures talent into their own body, represses the assumptions of wealth in other quarters, and commands the respect of poverty. But such liberal discernment of the truth is never to be expected from aspiring masses of men generally in narrow circumstances, like the revolutionary legislators of France. They would not even listen to arguments in favour of the inviolability of church-property, founded on its gradual acquisition from the pious munificence of individuals. Nothing could be patiently heard, but assertions that it was all public property: a convenient view which placed it entirely at the disposal of the dominant party. Ecclesiastical revenues having been seized, the church itself was quickly placed upon a new footing; bishoprics were reduced to the same number as the departments; both prelates and inferior incumbents were to be chosen by the same electors that chose the deputies; and chapters were suppressed.⁴ These encroachments upon the church were quickly followed⁵ by an order that all incumbents, under pain of deprivation, should swear to maintain the new constitution. This oath was refused by a great majority of the clerical body; and that proscription immediately began, which plunged churchmen in extreme misery, and confirmed the obstinate irreligion of France. The consummation of this fatal process was reserved for the November of 1793, when Gobet, the bishop of Paris, who had taken the oath to the existing constitution, appeared at the bar of the Assembly, attended by some of the clergy, and abjured the Christian faith. These infamous wretches declared no other national religion to be required than that of liberty, equality, and morality. Equal depravity and folly were exhibited by others of the revolutionary bishops and clergy; religion was now openly trampled under foot in all parts of France; the plate and everything else of any value in churches were seized; religious offices of every

¹ Alison, 166, 169.² Nov. 1789. *Ibid.* 210.³ *Ibid.* 212.⁴ *Ibid.* 216.⁵ Nov. 27, 1790. *Ibid.* 231.

kind were discontinued; and, to complete the mad insults heaped upon all that really benefits mankind, an impudent opera-singer was triumphantly drawn from the National Assembly to the cathedral of *Notre Dame*, and installed there as the *Goddess of Reason*. Henceforth, that venerable church was to be known by no other name than the *Temple of Reason*.¹ In 1794, this war against revelation was completed by the formal abolition of the Christian Sabbath. Not only the names of the months and days were changed,—and thus traces of anterior heathenism abolished,—but also the hebdomadal division of time was abandoned, months being divided into three decades, instead of four weeks.² Every tenth day was to be one of rest, instead of every seventh: an immense loss to the labouring classes, who were thus defrauded of one-fourth of the repose for which they had been immemorably indebted to Christianity. Surely such of them as had any space left in their hearts for sound feeling, or in their heads for sound reasoning, must have now begun to suspect that their real friends were not among the vociferous claimants of philanthropy and philosophy, but among believers in the Gospel. As a substitute for this holy system, a theatrical sect arose, which professedly adopted its morality, and took the name of *Theophilanthropists*.³ They opened four temples in Paris, where a sort of liturgy was chaunted, and moral discourses preached, the ancient attractions of an altar being supplied by an immense basket filled with beautiful flowers, as an emblem of the creation. The vain coxcombs, however, who figured in these pretended religious observances, rapidly fell into contempt, when the first novelty of their performances was gone. So ephemeral, indeed, was their importance, that all mention of them would be almost superfluous, were not their appearance at such a time an undeniable evidence that men must have a religion of some sort.

§ 10. This truth was forcibly shown in 1797, when clergymen were relieved from the penalties of imprisonment, or transportation, to which they had been rendered liable. Attempts were also made to allow the open use of the ancient worship, and even of bells to announce it; to permit crosses again over graves, and to relieve the clergy from the revolutionary oaths. The professed friends to the rights of man were not, however, as yet sufficiently leavened by any respect for the rights of conscience to pass such laws; but it was impossible to have them discussed with some prospect of success, until a reaction had begun in the public mind. Of this improvement in their prospects, great numbers, even of the emigrant laity, immediately took advantage. Among the clergy a still larger proportion returned to their flocks. They were generally received with extreme joy, especially in the western departments, and the long-intermitted offices of religion were eagerly resumed.⁴ Public worship, however, was wholly dependent upon the contributions of an irreligious nation,

¹ Alison, ii. 80.

² *Ibid.* 598.

³ *Ibid.* iii. 329.

⁴ *Ibid.* 345.

and consequently, most serious difficulties were found in keeping the churches open. Elderly females formed, in fact, the great bulk of the congregations.¹ At the outset of this religious revival, an ecclesiastical council, consisting of thirty-eight prelates, and fifty-three representatives of the inferior clergy, met in Paris. It agreed to a profession of faith, based on the creed of pope Pius IV.; maintained episcopacy to be needful for the proper government of the church; and so far courted the ruling powers, as to allow that an oath against the restoration of royalty was not incompatible with the Gospel. The proceedings were closed by an order for the communication of them to the pope, coupled with a request for the convocation of a general council.² Such an assembly, however, has very rarely been popular at Rome, and it was then obviously impracticable.

§ 11. The pope then actually possessed a mere shadow of his former power: he was driven into active warfare against the French republic, its troops invaded his territories, and his own troops, like other Italian armies, fled on the enemy's first onset. In consequence, Pius concluded the peace of Tolentino, on the 19th of February, 1797. By this humiliating treaty, he ceded the French territories attached to his see, and left the republic virtually master of all the rest: agreeing, besides, to pay an enormous pecuniary contribution, and to surrender one hundred of those first-rate works of art, which had long been the pride and a leading attraction of Rome.³ The payment of the contribution reduced his people to beggary, and the general misery was augmented by constant intrigues to rouse the populace into a revolt and establish a republic. These took full effect in February, 1798, when the papal government was formally overthrown. Pius was first removed into Tuscany, and eventually, after various changes, to Valence, in Dauphiny. He died there, on the 29th of August, 1799, in the eighty-second year of his age,⁴ after having exhibited a dignified firmness and a Christian resignation in his adversity, of which the vanity of his earlier years, fed by a fine person and extraordinary professional success, gave but slender promise. It was wished by the French Directory that no successor should be appointed,⁵ and the century closed with the pontifical throne vacant.

§ 12. In England, the Hanoverian succession extinguished effectually, as to protestants, that national intolerance which had been the bane and disgrace of former times. On the very day of Anne's demise, the *Schism Act* was to have come into operation: an odious measure, intended to place all but the commonest education wholly in the hands of the church. The queen's death rendered this proposed

¹ Alison, iv. 669.

² Coote, 240.

³ Alison, iii. 113.

⁴ *Ibid.* 542.

⁵ 'Lareveillere Lepaux, the President of the Directory, wrote to Napoleon: *In regard to Rome, the Directory cordially approve*

of the instructions you have given to your brother to prevent a successor being appointed to Pius VI. We must lay hold of the present favourable circumstances to deliver Europe from the pretended papal supremacy.' *Ibid.* 536.

infracton of man's indubitable rights a dead letter, no lawyer now being likely to sue for penalties under it, or the government to enforce them. In 1719 it was formally repealed, together with another act, passed in 1711, against *Occasional Conformity*. This unjust and impolitic law was meant to drive from office all those religious professors who generally worshipped with dissenters, and, no doubt, were very much of their opinion, but not so bigotedly as to induce an insurmountable objection against receiving the sacrament at church. Hence these persons made no scruple about this degree of conformity for the purpose of qualifying for office. To repel such dubious nonconformists, and thus drive them into obstinate dissent, was, undoubtedly, that palpable folly on the part of churchmen, which nothing but the violence of party spirit raging on both sides, and the intolerant habits of all former ages, can account for. When these oppressive and short-sighted statutes were repealed, a repeal also of the *Test Act* was in contemplation. But even the Whig party, then, as long afterwards, in the ascendant, was not satisfied that concession could be safely carried so far. That party then contained within itself many elements of disunion, and its proscribed opponents might have successfully used a step, extensively unpopular, for overthrowing its monopoly of power and patronage.¹ The government, indeed, very early, under the new dynasty, stood by no means on a satisfactory footing.² When George I. obtained possession of the throne, Tories appeared pleased no less than the Whigs.³ But he cast them wholly aside, and gave himself up unreservedly to the latter.⁴ Their modern apologists assign plausible reasons for this;⁵ but excluded contemporaries

¹ 'The disunion then prevailing among the Whigs, had caused so formidable an opposition, even to the former measures, that it was found necessary to abandon that project.' Hallam's *Const. Hist.* iii. 333.

² 'The strong symptoms of disaffection which broke out in a few months after the king's accession, and which can be ascribed to no grievance, unless the formation of a Whig ministry was to be termed one, prove the taint of the late times to have been deep-seated and extensive.' *Ibid.* 310.

³ 'They seemed as well satisfied with his majesty's peaceable accession, and attended the ceremony of his proclamation with as cheerful looks as any persons. Or if they were in a sudden fright, they, in a short time, so recovered themselves, as to lay no small claim to his majesty's favour. *The king*, they gave out, *intended to become an universal father of his people, and not to caress any particular party.*' *Calamy's Life and Times*, ii. 296, Lond. 1829.

⁴ 'Perhaps it might have been practicable for the king to have gradually conciliated the greater number of the more active Tories. His promotion of Whigs exclusively, and dismissal of Tories indiscriminately, from the recent conduct of both

respectively, was natural, though a more comprehensive scheme of policy would have been wise. At the time of the accession, the passions and prejudices of both sides were extremely high. The cool and impartial examination of a discerning and unbiassed stranger, must have seen that there were on both sides great abilities and great virtues, mingled with the violence and excesses of party zeal; and that the leading and acting men on both sides might be rendered useful in various departments of public service. But George, though discerning, was not unbiassed; though calm in his own temper, judicious in his opinions, and temperate in his conduct, yet, from his situation, and the connexions which it had dictated, he was become the member of a party; and ascended the throne of England, on the one hand, with the liberal and enlightened principles, but, on the other, with the prejudices and passions, of an English Whig.' Bisset's *George III.* i. 111, Lond. 1820.

⁵ 'In later times also, it has not been uncommon to censure George I. for governing, as it is called, by a faction. Nothing can be more unreasonable than this reproach. Was he to select those for his

naturally regarded it as caused by a selfish deceit put upon an ignorant foreigner. Nor did Walpole, during his long possession of power, either abate anything of that narrow spirit of party exclusion, which disgusted the nation generally, on the Hanoverian succession,¹ or of a reluctance to hazard his own position, by pressing any measure which he knew to be unpopular. He allowed the *Test Act* to remain in the statute-book, merely taking effectual care that it should sleep there, by the annual passing of an *Act of Indemnity*. Thus the full toleration of protestant dissent was regularly established, and by legislative authority, although seemingly but from year to year.² Every year, however, obviously rendered a return to the old system of intolerance more impracticable. Had Walpole possessed the manly honesty to conciliate the church party by his use of patronage, besides managing it by allowing an illusory continuance of the *Test Act*, he might probably have prevented some of the religious difficulties that arose in his day. Unhappily, however, crown patronage of every kind was regarded as little else than a powerful instrument for strengthening the Whig party. Even direct bribes were distributed among parliamentary members of that favoured body with a shamelessness that

advisers who had been, as we know and he believed, in a conspiracy with his competitor? Was Lord Oxford, even if the king thought him faithful, capable of uniting with any public men, hated as he was on each side? Were not the Tories as truly a faction as their adversaries, and as intolerant during their own power?' (Hallam, iii. 308.) This reasoning is little else than recrimination. There is little doubt that George I. might have diminished the difficulties of his situation, if he had honestly availed himself of his inexperience as a foreigner in English party politics, and, professing himself anxious only for the public service, looked out for efficient and trustworthy men on every side. His absolute surrender of himself, and of everything that he had to bestow, to the Whig party, naturally disgusted the greater part of the nation. The Tories might be, and undoubtedly were, 'as truly a faction as their adversaries;' but, viewed as 'a faction,' the Whigs laboured under this especial disadvantage, that they laid larger claims than their adversaries to superior enlightenment and liberality. These claims were naturally derided by the opposite party; and moderate men, very little of partisans, could hardly help feeling the derision just, when they saw such claims made a stepping-stone to a jealously-guarded narrow monopoly of power and profit.

¹ 'It was the policy of Walpole to keep alive the strongest prejudice in the mind of George II., obstinately retentive of prejudice, against the whole body of the Tories. They were ill-received at court, and generally excluded, not only from those depart-

ments of office which the dominant party have a right to keep in their power, but from the commission of the peace, and every other subordinate trust.' *Ibid.* 340.

² 'Walpole, more cautious and moderate than the ministry of 1719, perceived the advantage of reconciling the church as far as possible to the royal family, and to his own government; and it seems to have been an article in the tacit compromise with the bishops, who were not backward in exerting their influence for the crown, that he should make no attempt to abrogate the laws which gave a monopoly of power to the Anglican communion. We may presume also, that the prelates undertook not to obstruct the *Acts of Indemnity* passed from time to time in favour of those who had not duly qualified themselves for the offices they held; and which, after some time becoming regular, have, in effect, thrown open the gates to protestant dissenters.' *Ibid.* 334. (This was written before the repeal of the *Test Act*, in 1828.) 'The first act of this kind (Indemnity) appears to have been in 1727, 1 Geo. II. c. 23. It was repeated next year, intermitted in the next, and afterwards renewed in every year of that reign, except the fifth, the seventeenth, the twenty-second, the twenty-third, the twenty-sixth, and the thirtieth. Whether these occasional interruptions were intended to prevent the non-conformists from relying upon it, or were caused by some accidental circumstance, must be left to conjecture. I believe that the renewal has been regular every year since the accession of George III.' *Ibid.* note.

has ever since formed a conspicuous and most humiliating feature in English history.¹ The natural result was, that ministerial favour ordinarily passed for an evidence of individual corruption. In the church this feeling acted in a manner peculiarly injurious. The great majority of clergymen were Tories; and finding that no moderation of principles, or professional distinction, would ordinarily open the way to preferment, if unattended by Whig services or connexions, they naturally looked upon their own superiors with suspicion, and upon the government which promoted them with aversion. A body so divided could not be highly efficient. In the earlier Hanoverian times, accordingly, the church fell into a sort of stagnation. It maintained its ancient position in the country, and with a becoming dignity of external appearance. But ecclesiastical literature sank to a low ebb, and spiritual religion to a lower.

§ 13. The reign of George I. saw the virtual abolition of Convocation. William III. had kept that body in the sort of abeyance usual in modern times, during Tillotson's primacy, with little notice from any quarter.² The party that had lately defeated the scheme of comprehension was willing to rest for a season from any further agitation of such questions; and the party that had striven for it hoped for its adoption after late heats were effectually allayed by a few years of silence. In 1696, however, appeared a pamphlet, entitled *A Letter to a Convocation-man*, charging, with sufficient plainness, the reduction of convocation to a mere customary form, upon the king's general indifference to church affairs, and unfriendly eye to the national establishment, abetted by the ignorance of Tenison, now primate, and his anxiety to stand well at court.³ In the following year, William Wake, then one of the royal chaplains, and eventually archbishop of Canterbury, published a learned answer to this piece, in an octavo volume.⁴ This, in its turn, was answered, after a lapse of three years, by Atterbury.⁵ The subject now attracted universal attention, and a great ferment arose in the public mind: many persons, whose moderation was unsuspected, beginning to consider the church as defrauded of those rights which justly belonged to her, and which ought, for the general good, to be rendered active once more. The prevalence of this impression caused a meeting of the Convocation, in the year 1700, for the despatch of business.⁶ The spirit, however, shown by the

¹ 'There was always a strong suspicion, or rather a general certainty, of absolute corruption. The proofs, in single instances, could never, perhaps, be established; which, of course, is not surprising. But no one seriously called in question the reality of a systematic distribution of money by the crown to the representatives of the people; nor did the corruptors themselves, in whom the crime seems always to be deemedless heinous, disguise it in private.' Hallam, iii. 353.

² Nicholls says of archbishop Tillotson, 'per plures annos synodum cogere omisit.' (*Apparat. ad Def. Eccl. Angl.* 101.) Arch-

bishop Wake, however, says of king William, 'He assembled the Convocations duly with every Parliament.' *State of the Church and Clergy of England*, p. 520, Lond. 1703.

³ Nicholls, 102.

⁴ *The Authority of Christian Princes over their Ecclesiastical Synods asserted*, Lond. 1697.

⁵ In his *Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an English Convocation*. Wake answered this in 1703, by an elaborate folio, entitled, *The State of the Church and Clergy of England*.

⁶ Nicholls, 105.

lower house was so little satisfactory to the court, that it withheld the authority required for condemning some obnoxious books, and enacting new canons.¹ William's government continued at variance with the lower house of Convocation, which was bent upon assuming all the rights and privileges belonging to the House of Commons.² Anne was more favourable to the clergy; and their representatives, accordingly, displayed an activity under her which had been denied them in the last reign. Under George I. this was not immediately prevented; but the Convocation gave offence in 1717, by attacking Benjamin Hoadly, now bishop of Bangor, eventually of Winchester, who preached before the king on the 31st of March, in that year, a sermon on *The nature of the kingdom or Church of Christ*, which was published by special command. This famous discourse gave rise to the long paper war, known as the *Bangorian Controversy*. Hoadly had printed in the preceding year, *A Preservative against the Principles and Practices of the Non-jurors, both in Church and State*. His object in writing both pamphlet and sermon was, to answer a posthumous work, published just before, from the pen of George Hickes, the very learned non-juror. In accomplishing this purpose, he brought forward various principles which were considered by a large portion of the clergy quite inconsistent with sound views of ecclesiastical polity. Hence, when Convocation met, the lower house appointed a committee to make a selection of obnoxious passages from the bishop of Bangor's recent publications. The report was duly prepared, and placed on the journals by an unanimous vote, but before it could reach the upper house, a royal prorogation came down, and thus all further proceedings were prevented.³ Nor from this time until the middle of the next century was the Convocation ever allowed to sit for the despatch of any business. It merely met at the beginning of every Parliament in stately form, to hear divine service, and go through the preliminaries necessary for the constitutional exercise of its powers.

§ 14. Court patronage, in the earlier years of the Hanoverian dynasty, was not only exercised by statesmen, whose principles were distrusted by the church generally, and whose integrity was suspected

¹ 'Absque enim Principis licentia, neque illic fas est canonas condere, aut etiam de iis deliberare, aut denique de libris contra fidem conscriptis cognoscere.' Nicholls, 105.

² Hallam, iii. 327.

³ Life of Bp. Hoadly, prefixed to his Works, in three volumes, folio, Lond. 1783. His famous sermon is in the second volume, p. 403. It is preceded by *An Account of all the Considerable Pamphlets that have been published on either side, in the Present Controversy between the Bishop of Bangor and others*. This useful tract was written by Thomas Herne, M.A., but published under a feigned name. Hoadly's *Preservative* is in the first volume of his Works, p. 557. This prelate's abilities were of a superior order, but he was, perhaps, too much of a politician, and he took views of

many religious and ecclesiastical questions, which are called low, if not latitudinarian. Hence he has commonly been but little of a favourite among the English clergy, and is occasionally charged with a leaning towards Socinianism. He was born Nov. 14, 1676, and died at Chelsea, in the house then belonging to the see of Winchester, April 17, 1761. The importance of his famous sermon chiefly came from the rebellion under the old Pretender, in 1715. Hickes's posthumous papers were published with a view to shake the principles on which the Hanoverian family depended for support. Hoadly took the other side, and his advocacy was very highly valued. He had been made bishop of Bangor in 1715. In 1721, he was translated to Hereford; in 1723, to Salisbury; and in 1734, to Winchester.

in every quarter; there was also a dangerous relaxation of morals, and a poisonous taint of infidelity, very rife among public men. The religious current of queen Anne's feelings was succeeded, at St. James's, by one very different, and, on many accounts, unquestionably worse. George I. did not, indeed, by any means approach the reckless profligacy of Charles II.; but still he was, very considerably, an unblushing man of pleasure: his mistresses were obtruded on the public notice, and a virtuous contempt or pity for their infamy and his was obviously what no courtier could venture upon showing.¹ The highest circle in society being thus debased, superior life widely took the leprous infection; and as men hate what reproves and threatens themselves, the fashionable world became a school for disputants against revealed religion.² Among persons thus unhappily perverted, the teachers of Christianity, with their duties and rights, were naturally food for wanton mirth; or with graver spirits, all that antiquity had provided for spiritualising the nation, was regarded merely as a fund for managing the populace, and securing political influence. It was impossible to prevent unfriendly, or even serious minds, however disposed, from exaggerating the evils brought by such patronage upon the church. Men could not, indeed, fail of being preferred, at least occasionally, who must have remained at the bottom of any lay profession. Clergymen of enterprising talent, also, were driven by prevailing infidelity to spend their powers upon defending the mere outworks of Christianity, and to make pure ethics find an undue proportion of subjects for the pulpit. An age which loudly claimed an enlarged spirit of philosophy, might have been impatient under preaching of a cast prominently doctrinal.

§ 15. But religious instruction of a more evangelical character was

¹ 'The liberal principles and sentiments of the Whigs, extending toleration to the various sects of religionists, continued hateful to the high church: nor were the Whigs behind in enmity; their aversion to bigotry carried them into the opposite extreme. Many of them are justly chargeable with infidelity; and their leading politicians, if not unbelievers, were indifferent about religion, and great patrons of infidels. The court in general was very lukewarm in religious matters. With the minister himself, his supporters, and favourites, articles of faith, the church, and clergy, were most frequent and acceptable subjects of merriment and raillery. Impiety was extremely fashionable in the various gradations of society, to which the court example did not fail to reach. Corresponding to such a state of religion, there was a great laxity of manners. To this evil the conduct of the court had its share in contributing. George, though by no means profligate in his own character, yet tended to encourage licentious gallantry; according to the mode of debauched courts on the continent, the king's

mistresses made their appearance regularly among the nobility, were visited by women of the highest rank and fashion, and even introduced to the young princesses, his grand-daughters. The minister, and all who possessed or sought royal favour, paid a most submissive attention to the royal favourites. Where such persons presided, modesty and chastity could not be expected greatly to prevail. Decency and morality were by no means characteristics of George's court.' Bisset's *George III.* i. 118.

² 'Like William III. the first George was vehemently suspected of heresy and infidelity, because in his tolerant court there were those who avowed their scepticism, without imitating Bolingbroke, the infidel minister of Anne, by combining it in monstrous alliance with intolerance.' (Bogue and Bennet's *History of Dissenters*, Lond. 1833, ii. 108.) The authors, however, show, in a note below, containing a citation from *Mist's Journal*, a Tory newspaper, that current objections to George's government commonly ran on the disgraceful influence of loose women about the court.

required, in order to reach the hearts of men in every walk of life. The requirement evoked a spirit which awakened England from religious apathy, but rent her with a lamentable schism. Samuel Wesley came of a puritanical family, and married into one: both he and his wife, however, conformed to the national church, and imbibed a decided preference for it; which was rendered more satisfactory to its best friends, by their strong understandings and exemplary conduct. He was a clergyman, and having attained some degree of eminence during the infatuated reign of James II., he had a prospect offered him of obtaining preferment, on condition of abetting the court policy; but although his politics were of the Tory school, he was a zealous protestant, and nothing could make him forget the paramount calls of a Scriptural faith. On the revolution, accordingly, he wrote in favour of that great national change. This gained him the rectory of Epworth, and subsequently another, far less valuable, that of Wroote. Both were crown benefices in Lincolnshire. He held Epworth more than forty years, with signal advantage to the parish, which he served with a zeal, faithfulness, and ability, that are very rarely surpassed. He had three sons, of whom Samuel, the eldest, was educated at Westminster, and became a superior scholar. He died master of Tiverton school, in Devonshire, when under fifty. John, the second son, was born in 1703, and was placed at the Charterhouse in 1714; a school to which he remained strongly attached through life, never failing to visit his old haunts there, on his annual visits to London. In his seventeenth year he went to Christchurch, Oxford, where he displayed those exemplary morals and studious habits, which bore honourable witness to the great advantages that he had enjoyed under his paternal roof. He does not, however, appear to have felt any extraordinary force of religious feeling, until his mind was occupied by the contemplation of deacon's orders; these he took in 1725, and in the following year he was elected fellow of Lincoln college. By this time, such a marked seriousness had come over him, that it was urged to his disadvantage at the election; but he had unquestionably qualities to secure the suffrages of conscientious electors, and they did not suffer themselves to violate their obligations because they had a candidate whom a few inconsiderate observers thought ridiculously particular. In 1728 he was ordained priest; in the following year, after an absence in Lincolnshire as his father's curate, he returned to Oxford, where his brother Charles, who was five years younger than himself, then resided as a student of Christchurch. John had urged greater seriousness upon him, some time before, but a natural liveliness of disposition seemingly rendered such admonition useless. When John, however, came back to college in 1729, he found himself to have made a powerful impression upon his brother's mind. Charles attended the sacrament every week, having persuaded two or three fellow-students to accompany him, and rigidly observe such *methods* of study as were prescribed by the university statutes. These highly methodical habits obtained for him the appellation of *Methodist*, a term which eventually distinguished

the religious body that he was largely instrumental in forming, and another of a kindred spirit. To Charles Wesley and his young friends John cordially joined himself, and the party soon afterwards obtaining a few accessions, its movements became the mark for general observation. The members spent some evenings in the week together, chiefly in reading the Greek Testament, and devoted portions of their mornings to visits among the sick in the city, and among prisoners in the gaols. Proceedings so unusual with university students, made considerable noise, and the elder Wesley became rather uneasy: he went in consequence to Oxford, in 1731, to make his own observations, but came away perfectly satisfied, writing to his wife from London, immediately afterwards, that he was well repaid for the expense and trouble of his recent visit to the university, by seeing there 'the shining piety of their two sons.' This venerable ecclesiastic died in 1735, after having vainly attempted to persuade his son John into an application for succeeding him at Epworth. That remarkable man professed himself unequal to the charge of two thousand souls, and satisfied that his own good, and the good of others, would be best promoted by his continuance at Oxford. He embraced, however, an invitation to go as a missionary into Georgia, then a colony in its first infancy; and landed in that country, with his brother Charles, now in orders, in 1736. Both were severely disappointed: prospect of preaching to the Indians, which they had contemplated, there was none: nor were the licentious, turbulent, struggling spirits that had just sought refuge from domestic ills in expatriation, at all suited for benefiting by clerical services rendered under notions of ascetic strictness and high ecclesiastical authority. The brothers, accordingly, soon aroused a storm of opposition in the infant colony, and Charles, after the trial of a few arduous months, returned to England, with despatches from the governor. John remained in Georgia, but only to make his difficulties greater, by mingling his austere piety and exalted estimate of ministerial prerogatives with overtures of marriage, which he afterwards retracted. He thus gave a colour for charging him, when he repelled the rejected party from the communion, with abusing his authority to vent his resentment. A suit was then brought against him for defamation, and for various alleged ministerial irregularities. This was protracted in the most vexatious manner, evidently with a view of driving him from the colony. At length he determined upon withdrawing, and made a sort of clandestine escape. He reached London in February, 1738. He there became very much connected with the Moravians, who had already gained largely upon his affections in the voyage to Georgia, some pious members of the body being his fellow-passengers, and he first joined them for religious worship. Subsequently he became dissatisfied with some doctrines introduced among them, and resolved upon forming a new society. While still, however, far from contemplating such a step as this, he passed over into Germany, and visited the Moravian settlements there. On his return to London, in September, 1738, he began immediately upon that prominence in the

religious world which must ever make his name conspicuous in ecclesiastical history. He was averse from settling himself as a parochial minister, but gladly availed himself of every opportunity to occupy a parish-pulpit. His doctrine differed widely from that ethical strain which then prevailed among preachers; and being better fitted for touching the heart, as well as delivered with unusual power, great crowds rapidly congregated in every church where Wesley was to be heard. Many of the clergy treated his opinions as exaggerated, and hence likely to mislead. Among the laity of better condition, this objection was aggravated by another, arising from the multitudes, and consequent inconveniences, that his preaching brought. After a time, accordingly, almost every pulpit in London was closed against him. He soon, however, became above such impediments, having surmounted his original scruples as to ecclesiastical irregularity, and taken to preaching in the open air. His influence now in lower life became prodigious, and, in a vast number of cases, there can be no doubt, most beneficial, very many being turned by him from a sottish eagerness after mere animal gratifications to an effective recollection that the body is only half the man, and the worse half too. At length, in 1740, Wesley became regularly the minister of a registered chapel in Moorfields, London, and the society of Methodists was formed under his direction.¹ He was, however, by no means prepared for any secession from the national church; on the contrary, he was careful to assemble his congregation at hours which did not interfere with those of the regular parochial service, and to the parish altar he directed it on sacrament Sundays. These provisions, however, soon occasioned considerable inconveniences. Wesley's followers commonly became averse from hearing such doctrine at church as differed strikingly from that delivered in their own places of worship, and even from receiving the sacrament at the hands of clergymen who preached it. Hence their attendance at many churches was remarkably thin, after a few years; and the arrangements made for it, by the closing of their own chapels, caused much of that time which would have been gladly spent in public worship, to be passed with less advantage, as it would commonly be found, at home. The sacrament also fell into much neglect, although, at one time, Wesley's followers formed in many parish-churches the great body of the communicants. In the later years of his life, their great head became, indeed, sensible that separation from the national establishment was inevitable; but he never gave it his personal sanction, and he took pains to render it as mild as possible. The result has been, that the Wesleyan Methodists differ importantly from the great mass of protestant dissenters; considering themselves rather as supplementary to

¹ 'It became necessary for the new sectarists either to endure all the injuries which the nonconformists suffered for nearly thirty years, or to contradict their solemn professions of indissoluble union with the established church, by classing themselves with

the Dissenters, taking refuge under the Toleration Act, registering their places of worship, and licencing their preachers, as that act required.' Bogue and Bennet, ii. 116.

the church, than alienated from it. Practically, they are, indeed, a large body of separatists, with a complete organisation of their own for every religious purpose: neither sacramental ministrations, nor any other, being even professedly dependent, in the slightest degree, upon the national establishment.¹ But then they have never professed to undervalue ministrations in the church, or the utility of a religious provision made by the state. Nor have they, as a body, or even have many individuals among them, joined in any political movements for the depression or extinction of the church. Thus their separation stands honourably prominent, as made upon grounds purely spiritual; and the establishment, however doubtful of them as a body of unmanageable allies, has the satisfaction of knowing them to be no real enemies, either open or concealed. Their great founder, John Wesley,² died in London, on the 2nd of March, 1791, at the great

¹ 'Thus a religious society was raised up within the national church, and with this anomaly, that, as to all its interior arrangements as a society, it was independent of the ecclesiastical authority of that church. The irregularity was, in principle, as great when the first step was taken as at any future time. It was a form of practical and partial separation, though not of theoretical dissent; but it arose out of a moral necessity, and existed for some years in such state, that had the clergy been disposed to co-operate in this evident revival and spread of true religion, and had the heads of the church been willing to sanction itinerant labours among its ministers, and private religious meetings among the serious part of the people for mutual edification, the great body of Methodists might have been retained in communion with the church of England. On this matter, which was often brought before the leading and influential clergy, they made their own election. They refused to co-operate: they, doubtless, thought that they acted right; and, excepting the obloquy and persecution with which they followed an innocent and pious people, they perhaps did so; for a great innovation would have been made upon the discipline of the church; for which, at that time at least, it was little prepared.' (Watson's *Life of Wesley*, p. 134, Lond. 1839.) It was the policy of the Roman church, when any great religious movement occurred, professing a deference for her authority, to take measures for combining it with herself. If the church of England, when Wesley and Whitefield acquired an irresistible influence, had been able to foresee their ultimate importance, and had possessed sufficient means for following the example of her great rival, she would have acted wisely in doing so. Unhappily, however, men cannot see so far; and, besides, politics tied her hands. The superior clergy were generally of a different party from the

inferior, and therefore naturally viewed by them as preferred from motives little connected with professional eminence. Hence, if convocation had been allowed to resume that activity, which was required for arranging the amalgamation of Methodism with the establishment, embarrassing contentions were more likely to arise than any useful result. The time, however, may come, when dangers of this kind are much less to be apprehended. If such should be the case, it may admit of serious consideration whether Methodism, even yet, cannot obtain a formal admission within the establishment. A revival of the subdiaconate might satisfactorily qualify preachers of a semi-laical character, at least for pulpits provided by their own society, but recognised by the church. The admission of the Wesleyan conference, and any other well-defined, approved body to regulate its own, though episcopally ordained, subdeacons, with places of worship provided for them by itself, would be little or nothing more exceptionable, than the papal system, which places religious orders under generals and machinery of their own.

² [The death of Wesley was an irreparable loss to his followers, and was immediately followed by differences which have broken out into periodical schisms. The chief subjects of debate have been the position of the laity, the organisation of the church, and the extension of discipline. *The pacification of 1795*, which was intended to reconcile all differences, settled that the Conference, or general assembly, had the exclusive right of nominating the preachers, and gave to the *district meeting* the power of dismissing any on the ground of immorality. By this act, the Methodists claimed the name of a church, and the right to administer the sacraments. In 1797, the first secession was formed under the Rev. Alexander Kilham, and called the Wesleyan New Connexion. The ground of

age of eighty-eight, leaving a character and influence behind him, that may well be envied by all who value that sort of anxiety for heaven which is shown by a perfect willingness to do, suffer, and renounce everything, when religion appears to call for the exertion or sacrifice. Charles Wesley died on the 29th of March, 1788, at the age of seventy-nine, leaving a family behind. John, though married, and unhappily, left no issue.¹ The two brothers were among the most remarkable men of their time, and although churchmen cannot fail of regretting that their talents and labours took an irregular direction, thereby occasioning a great mass of actual dissent, yet it must be admitted, that this disadvantage came in the most unexceptionable form, and that the Wesleys, by arousing a dormant spirit of religious inquiry, conferred a vital benefit upon the country at large.

§ 16. Within five years after the Wesleys attracted general notice at Oxford, and were stigmatised as Methodists there, another student, who soon became equally conspicuous, entered in that university. George Whitefield was descended from a respectable family, numbering beneficed clergymen and independent proprietors among its members; but his father was bred a wine-merchant, and he ultimately kept the Bell Inn at Gloucester. In that house the future preacher was born, in 1714. His father lived only to see him two years old, and his mother's circumstances becoming bad, he was driven at one time to act as waiter. He had, at an earlier age, been carefully kept from any concern with the business of the house, and sent to the grammar-school of his native city, with a view to orders. To this school he returned, on seeing a prospect of admission at Oxford as a servitor. In that capacity he entered at Pembroke College, in 1734. He took with him a more serious cast of mind than is very usual at his then age: a struggling boyhood, spent among the vulgar temp-

their separation was the very small power allowed to the laity in the government of the body, and the resistance of the Conference to the introduction of lay delegates. In 1810, the *Primitive Methodists* seceded: the Conference had forbidden the restoration of the violent methods of procedure practised by the early preachers. In 1815, a new society, formed on Wesleyan principles, originated by William O'Bryan, a Cornish preacher, took the name of *Bible Christians*. The *Wesleyan Methodist Association* was formed by seceders under Dr. Warren, who opposed the foundation of a theological institution for the training of ministers, in 1835. Another quarrel arose in 1843, on the publication of certain anonymous *Fly-Sheets*, in which several reforms were demanded. The Conference, offended by this attack, ordered the question to be put to several of its members, 'Are you the author of the fly-sheets?' Messrs. Everett, Dunn, and Griffiths refused to answer, and were expelled. This act provoked much feeling

among the Wesleyans, and a very large number of congregations seceded, out of sympathy, and from desire of reform. These are called *Wesleyan Reformers*, and are said to have formed about one-third of the whole body. All these bodies retain the original doctrines of Wesleyan Methodism. —The Methodist episcopal church, founded by Wesley in America, has experienced two secessions: one, in 1828, originated the *Protestant Methodists*; one, in 1842, on the ground of slavery, the *Wesleyan Methodist Church*. The number of chapels belonging to the English Methodists, in 1851, was: Old Connexion, 6,579; New Connexion, 297; Primitive Methodists, 2,871; Bible Christians, 403; Association, 329; Reformers, 339. G. Marsden's *Christian Churches*, ii. 370; and the Census of Religious Worship, 1851. *Ed.*]

¹ In preparing this paragraph, Watson's *Life of Wesley* has been exclusively used. Southey's, however, is much fuller, and more philosophical.

tations of an inn, having found his vigorous understanding, and ardent temperament, in many occasions for anxious thought, and some, for self-accusation. In Oxford, he soon became acquainted with the Wesleys; but his temper was far more enthusiastic than theirs, and a lower scale of domestic nurture pushed his ascetic mortifications down to a coarser level. No degree of self-denial would content him, until he had in some sort imitated our blessed Saviour, in being with the wild beasts, when he was tempted. Whitefield accordingly spent nearly two hours on two following nights in Christchurch meadow, praying, sometimes flat on his face, at others, on his knees. The former of these nights proved stormy; and while the elements roared, instead of seeking shelter, he merely felt reminded of the day of judgment. In all these excesses of religious fear, there is no reason to believe that Whitefield had any eye to display; but his appearance became so remarkable, from wretched attire, intentional exposure to cold, and emaciation from insufficient sustenance, that he could not escape notice. His tutor considered him insane; and it can hardly be doubted, that he had sunk into that mental unhealthiness, which is at least upon the very verge of insanity. He had, besides, injuriously tampered with his constitution, and an illness of seven weeks was the penalty. His tutor's conduct at this time was that of a kind and judicious parent: he lent him books, gave him money, visited him, and sent a physician to him. The result was, that, as his frame recovered its vigour, and his spirits their elasticity, the gloom that had weighed him to the earth was dissipated, and his sanguine temperament became as buoyant as ever. He had lost none of his religious feelings, but having shaken off a great load of physical disease, he found them rise to his imagination with a golden hue. This is, therefore, considered as the period of his conversion; it is, in fact, the period from which he made overpowering passions and strong religious convictions go on harmoniously together. He was ordained deacon in his native city, in 1736, and almost immediately displayed a surprising capacity for popular eloquence in the pulpit. Immense congregations hung upon his lips both in Bristol and London; but he tore himself away from this fascinating popularity, and sailed for Georgia, to assist Wesley. That eminent man was, however, gone before Whitefield reached his destination, and he made himself a very short stay, returning to London about the close of 1738. In the following year he was ordained priest at Oxford. Being soon again in London, he found his popularity continually on the increase, but opposition to him kept pace with it, and finding himself generally excluded from churches, he took to field-preaching. His enormous metropolitan congregations mustered in Moorfields, Kennington Common, and Blackheath, which then, and indeed long afterwards, offered great facilities for such labours as his,—being open spaces of considerable size, on the edges of dense populations. It was computed that he commonly addressed in these places twenty or thirty thousand auditors, and sometimes even double the latter number. When these prodigious auditories

sang, their notes were sometimes carried by the gale to a distance, it was thought, of nearly two miles; even the preacher's voice, to that of nearly one. The immediate inciting cause of these extraordinary proceedings was his desire to raise funds for the building and endowment of an orphan school and college in Georgia. These views led him gradually to such a degree of prominence in the religious world, as went utterly beyond the bare fulfilment of his original intention. As years rolled on, he travelled over nearly all parts of the British isles, and a very considerable portion of British North America, establishing an immense influence in all quarters. He thus became, like Wesley, the parent of a mighty sect, allied to the church of England; but one that had, in fact, much more the character of early puritanism. Whitefield's excessive labours wore him out, at a period of life greatly short of that attained by Wesley: he died at Newbury Port, near Boston, in New England, on the 30th of September, 1770. His piety, zeal, and popular eloquence are unquestionable: nor can it be doubted that he rendered very considerable service in arousing a general attention to religious subjects: but he suffered himself to be betrayed by natural impetuosity into a dogmatism, and an uncandid estimate of opponents, that a strong sense of religion, like his, would have avoided, if it had been acted upon by greater constitutional equanimity.¹

§ 17. Neither Wesley nor Whitefield appears to have attained eminence with the previous recommendation of much theological knowledge. Both, perhaps, were too young: the latter certainly was altogether so. The result of their common deficiency gradually showed itself: they long laboured against the prevailing tide of immorality, and indolent formalism in religion, often driving people, by the fervour of their eloquence, into the opposite extreme of a delusive and offensive enthusiasm; but upon some of the points which had caused great religious excitement in earlier times, they seem to have set out with no very definite opinions. Wesley, indeed, was too much occupied with his favourite theory of man's capacity for moral perfection, to think long upon the spirit-stirring topics of predestination and election. Whitefield, however, during his absence in America, between the years 1739 and 1741, put forth two letters, which denounced archbishop Tillotson's Sermons, and *The Whole Duty of Man*, as written in as much ignorance of Christianity, as ever was in Mahomet. He afterwards admitted, that, in penning these letters, he had suffered zeal to outrun discretion; but no acknowledgment of reprehensible incaution would stop the ferment occasioned

¹ Whitefield wrote of Dr. Stebbing, who had attacked some of his doctrine: 'To me he seems to know no more of the true nature of regeneration than Nicodemus did, when he came to Jesus by night.' To bishop Gibson, who had recommended the preaching of justification by faith, but not exactly as Whitefield preached it, he wrote: 'This, my lord, is truly a new gospel. It

is as contrary to the doctrine of the church of England, as light is contrary to darkness.' Dissenting congregations he denounced as 'companies of banded formalists,' and dissenting ministers he talked of as 'feeding the flock with husks instead of wholesome food.' Philip's *Life and Times of Whitefield*, p. 87, 89, 91, Lond. 1838.

by such an attack upon two writers in great favour with England. Among the parties disgusted was Wesley, who published soon after a sermon against absolute predestination, esteeming that doctrine, and others of the Calvinistic school, as very likely to produce Antinomianism. Whitefield had now become thoroughly imbued with doctrines of the Genevan stamp; and a controversy ensued between him and his former friend, which, besides giving a temporary shock to his own popularity, engendered angry feelings on both sides, and estranged the two parties from each other, during several years. In 1750, however, they were reconciled;¹ but this was merely a personal satisfaction: their followers remained at variance with each other; those of Wesley taking the Arminian side, those of Whitefield the Calvinistic. In this divided state the Methodistic body still continues. It is agreed as to the importance of estimating religious impressions by their operation on the feelings, and as to the general excellence of the church of England; but it is altogether divided upon questions relating to predestination and election.²

§ 18. One section of its Calvinistic branch attracted a large degree of public notice from the zealous countenance and extraordinary liberality of Selina, daughter of Washington Shirley, second earl Ferrars, and widow of Theophilus Hastings, ninth earl of Huntingdon of that family. This lady was long averse from quitting the national church. Hence the preachers whom she originally patronised were clergymen, and the chapels opened by her means, though not episcopally licenced, or parochially connected, passed with many, during several years, for genuine offshoots from the establishment. At length, however, proceedings were instituted in the ecclesiastical court by the incumbent of Clerkenwell church, against certain clergymen, who preached within the parish, at a large chapel, facing Spa Fields, then an open space, on the northern outskirts of London. This place of worship was opened in 1779, without episcopal licence, under the countess of Huntingdon's patronage. Two of her chaplains, Thomas Wills and William Taylor, who were among the parties under prosecution, seceded at once from the established church, by taking the oaths legally required of dissenting ministers. They professed, however, an unshaken partiality for the doctrines contained in the national formularies, and grounded their secession solely on the legal impossibility of continuing to minister as clergymen in any place of public worship that had not episcopal allowance. These two individuals, in 1783, ordained six young men, who had been duly educated, and who severally detailed before the assembled congregation various particulars of their spiritual states. These accounts were represented as quite sufficient to justify their ordination, although, most probably,

¹ Philip, 195. Watson, 129.

² [Most of the congregations founded by Whitefield are now absorbed in the Congregationalist or Independent body. The few exceptions are the countess of Huntingdon's Connexion, which in 1851 possessed 109 chapels. The Welsh Calvinistic Methodists

did not originate with Whitefield directly, but with Howel Harris of Trevecca, a Welsh gentleman, who instituted private societies on the plan of Wesley, but without communication with him. This began in 1796. The Welsh Calvinistic Methodists, in 1851, had 828 chapels. *Edz.*]

no bishop would ordain the parties. The two seceded clergymen who undertook to do this, claimed such a power as inherent in those that had been themselves regularly ordained: an advantage which was indisputably their own. Their principle, therefore, was, that presbyters alone are competent to continue the presbyteral succession, in cases where this is important, and episcopal intervention is unattainable. The countess of Huntingdon lived eight years after this provision for keeping up the religious body with which her name is identified. She died, June 17, 1791, in the eighty-fourth year of her age. Even her friends admit that she loved power, and was impatient of advice: but more than half her life was, undoubtedly, such an admirable pattern of self-devotion to religious conviction as rarely reads a lesson to mankind.¹

§ 19. While one class of minds, attentive to religion, was extolling and propagating enthusiastic fervours, another would have completely lowered even conceptions of the Deity down to the level of human reason. The first clergyman of any note, who came forward with such views, was Francis Blackburne, archdeacon of Cleveland, and rector of Richmond, in Yorkshire, the place of his nativity. He had rendered himself rather conspicuous, while a student at Cambridge, for adopting those notions of Locke, Hoadly, and the like, which their admirers talk of as enlightened and liberal, but which pass with many, well worthy of attention, for latitudinarian and unsound.² These opinions he took into the country, and found them strengthened daily by his habits of reading and reflection. After some previous publications, advocating his peculiar sentiments, that attracted no great notice, he published anonymously, in 1766, *The Confessional: or a Full and Free Inquiry into the Right, Utility, and Success of establishing Confessions of Faith and Doctrine, in Protestant Churches*. This work, which attacked existing theological tests, made a powerful impression on the public, and gave rise to a long controversy. The author, whose moral character, and whose industry as a parochial minister, and as a studious man, are unquestionable, had adopted opinions akin to the Socinian, but admitting the previous existence of Christ with some sort of divinity; and he refused further preferment, because he would not again subscribe to the articles. But he never gave up what he had already in the church; a blemish in his character which those who think with him vindicate from the charge

¹ *The Life and Times of Selina, Countess of Huntingdon*, ii. 312, 316, 436, 444, 445, Lond. 1844. [The church of the New Jerusalem was founded by Emanuel Swedenborg, a Swedish nobleman who died in 1772. He maintained that he had divine revelations since 1745, and was commissioned to proclaim to the world a new spiritual sense of Holy Scripture. According to this, the New Jerusalem descended from heaven in 1757, and realised spiritually the second coming of the Lord. His doctrine of the Trinity

is said to be heretical, viz. that the Father, Son, and Spirit are united in Christ, as soul, body, and proceeding operation are one in every individual man. Marsden, ii. 325. *Census of Religious Worship*, 1851. *Ed.*]

² Blackburne, however, did not resemble later holders of his opinions in tenderness for popery. On the contrary, he wished to restrain it within narrower bounds than the government of that time approved; a wish which modern claimants of superior liberality deem hardly worthy of him.

of interestedness, by the mention of an offer that he declined, of undertaking the pastorship of a congregation in London, agreeing with him in sentiment, and which would have been to his pecuniary advantage.¹ Two of his immediate connexions, however, Theophilus Lindsey, who married his daughter-in-law, and Dr. Disney, who married his daughter, acted with greater consistency. Both surrendered church preferments, because they had imbibed notions adverse to a belief in the Trinity. The former opened a large room for public worship according to his opinions, in Essex Street, London, in 1774. As his theology had been excepted in the Toleration Act, some difficulties were, at first, made by the magistrates upon the registration of this room; but the age was adverse to any strict interpretation of such statutes, and he not only then carried his point, but also, in 1778, he was enabled to supersede his licenced room by a commodious chapel. His followers have repudiated the appellation of Socinians, by which most other Christians have distinguished people of their opinions, and call themselves Unitarians,—a name which seems to insinuate a charge of polytheism upon the Christian world generally. The Essex Street congregation, which proved the parent of a numerous progeny, adopted a liturgy professedly altered from that of the national church according to a plan of Dr. Samuel Clarke, rector of St. James's, Westminster.² The party has also published a New Testament, claiming freedom from interpolation, and greater accuracy of interpretation, than is to be found in the authorised version; but the great mass of scholars has neither admitted its charges of interpolation, nor considered its claims to superior fidelity as worthy of any reliance. The most distinguished Englishman of this school was Dr. Joseph Priestley, son of a Leeds manufacturer, and born near that place in 1733. His parents were Calvinistic dissenters, and they meant him for a minister among that class of Christians. He became, however, an Arian, when quite a young man, but soon changed that belief for one in the simple humanity of Christ. In the defence and propagation of this doctrine, his industry was unwearied, though his scholarship appeared highly questionable; and he had the honour of no less a scholar than Samuel Horsley (successively bishop of St. David's, Rochester, and St. Asaph)³ for an antagonist. By the world in

¹ Rees's *Cyclopædia*, art. *Blackburne*.—This compilation, having been conducted by an editor of similar opinions, is full upon questions connected with Socinianism.

² Rees's *Cyclopædia*, art. *Lindsey*.

³ 'In the year 1782, an open and vehement attack was made by Dr. Priestley upon the creeds and established discipline of every church in Christendom, in a work in 2 vols. 8vo, entitled, *A History of the Corruptions of Christianity*. At the head of these the author placed both the catholic doctrine of our Lord's divinity, and the Arian notion of his pre-existence in a nature far superior to the human, representing the Socinian doctrine of his mere hu-

manity as the unanimous faith of the first Christians. It seemed that the most effectual preservative against the intended mischief would be to destroy the writer's credit and the authority of his name, which the fame of certain lucky discoveries in the prosecution of physical experiments had set high in popular esteem, by proofs of his incompetency in every branch of literature connected with his present subject, of which the work itself afforded evident specimens in great abundance. For this declared purpose, a review of the imperfections of his work, in the first part relating to our Lord's divinity, was made the subject of a charge delivered to the clergy of the archdeaconry

general, however, he has been more noticed as a chemist; important discoveries in the nature and properties of gases having been made by him. Unhappily for his repose, he could not content himself with science and theology, but became an ardent politician of the French revolutionary school. This rendered him obnoxious to a large portion of the people in Birmingham, where he was fixed as minister of a dissenting congregation. A celebration, accordingly, of the capture of the Bastille, fixed for the anniversary of that event, in 1791, caused a great ferment among those inhabitants of Birmingham who deprecated revolutionary politics. Priestley did not choose to join the festal party, but his name was identified with its principles; and in the riot excited by popular detestation of them, his house, with its valuable scientific apparatus and library, perished by fire. He now removed to Hackney, near London; but his political views were too much disliked by the great majority of Englishmen, to render him easy in any part of the kingdom. Hence he emigrated to the United States of America, in 1794; and within ten years afterwards he died at Northumberland, in Pennsylvania, highly respected in all quarters for purity of morals and scientific eminence; and venerated also among the admirers of his theology, now grown a numerous body, for the bulk and presumed erudition of his polemical writings.¹

of St. Alban's, the spring next following Dr. Priestley's publication. The specimens alleged of the imperfections of the work, and the incompetency of its author, may be reduced to six general classes: instances of reasoning in a circle; instances of quotations misapplied through ignorance of the writer's subject; instances of testimonies perverted by artful and forced constructions; instances of passages in the Greek fathers misinterpreted through ignorance of the Greek language; instances of passages misinterpreted through the same ignorance, and driven farther out of the way by an ignorance of the Platonic philosophy; instances of ignorance of the phraseology of the earliest ecclesiastical writers.' (Preface to Bp. Horsley's *Tracts in Controversy with Dr. Priestley*, v. Dundee, 1812.) This volume, which was edited by the bishop's son, contains the St. Alban's charge, together with the various letters and disquisitions to which it gave rise, including a sermon on the Incarnation. Dr. Priestley's *Institutes of Natural and Revealed Religion* may be considered as a Socinian body of divinity, though it is professedly not polemical. It controverts, however, the inspiration of the Scriptures, the separate state of the soul, and the eternity of future punishments: and as the former part is a mere speculation on what the light of nature might teach, which the doctor confesses to be very little; in the latter, the same speculative turn prevails concerning the contents of Scripture. Of this most able and best writ-

ten work of the Socinian *Coryphæus*, it may be said, that what is good is borrowed, and what is original is good for nothing. The controversial supplement to the *Institutes* is Dr. Priestley's celebrated *History of the Corruptions of Christianity*. Viewed as an historical defence of Socinianism, or rather as a death-stroke to the deity and atonement of Christ, announced with some parade, it must strike every intelligent reader as the ridiculous birth of a parturient mountain. One short section of a work that extends through two thick volumes, contains all the polemical history to prove the earliest Christians Socinians; but which proves that Dr. Priestley, unable to find historic documents, could substitute for them mere suppositions, or the modest assumption that the primitive Christians must have believed what the doctor believes.' Bogue and Bennet, ii. 511.

¹ Rees's *Cyclopædia*, art. *Priestley*. It is there said of him, 'In his intellectual frame were combined quickness, activity, acuteness, and that inventive faculty, which is the characteristic of genius. These qualities were less suited to the laborious investigation of what is called erudition, than the argumentative deductions of metaphysics, and the experimental researches of natural philosophy. Assiduous study had, however, given him a familiarity with the learned languages, sufficient in general to render the sense of the authors clear to him, and he aimed at nothing more.' This is a very unsatisfactory account of one who sought

§ 20. Blackburne's movements towards Socinianism aroused kindred spirits among his brethren to seek release from the terms on which they took and held preferment. In 1772, a petition, hastily prepared, but signed by two hundred and fifty clergymen, was presented to the House of Commons, praying relief from subscription to the articles and liturgy.¹ The clerical petitioners were associated with others, chiefly lawyers and physicians, who complained of the necessity to subscribe on matriculation in the two universities, as being a compliance generally exacted at an age quite incompetent for the due understanding of recondite questions. The supporters of the petition displayed its presumed merits in specious generalities, such as the honour and advantage of toleration. They also, but with less discretion, attacked the articles themselves, declaring them to be contradictory in some parts, and indefensible in others. An additional reason for concession was found in the dissenters themselves, who were said to be likely to conform in great numbers, if there no longer existed any articles to repel them. By those who valued a sound protestant faith, and feared to throw open the national endowments that supported it, to every one able to obtain a benefice, this proposition was firmly resisted. Great stress was laid on the recent boldness of heterodoxy; old attacks upon the Church of England having now been backed with arguments against our Saviour's divinity, with blasphemous assaults, therefore, upon the very vitals of Christianity. Clerical complaints of hardship in subscription were very fairly derided. None need keep or take a benefice who felt pinched in conscience by the articles or liturgy: while it was of great importance, that national funds for the teaching of religion should not be diverted into a number of irreconcilable channels. Even lawyers and physicians, with other members of the universities who had entered without an eye to orders, were spoken of as under no necessity to seek education in those seminaries. If they, or their friends, had any invincible repugnance to the doctrinal tests required of students, they might qualify for their several professions in other places. One point, however, urged by the friends of the petition, was conceded by some on the other side. Dissenting ministers were liable to be called upon by the Act of Toleration, to subscribe the doctrinal articles of the church; and this was represented as no great hardship, while such divines were generally Calvinists, although it might be rather unreasonable to demand even this approbation for a system from which the subscribers did not wish, and could not receive, either honour or

to unsettle, and did really unsettle, the faith of others, by a show of erudition. The theological questions with which Priestley grappled, are essentially learned, and can only be mastered, by the patient industry of a deep scholar. Priestley's friends, however, are driven to admit his incompetence to make a satisfactory array of learned evidence, both from the unfitness of his mind for the labour of such a task, and a want of sound scholarship.

¹ 'The petition was drawn up with such haste, and the arguments adduced were so ill selected and applied, that its enemies had little trouble in refuting them.' (Collins, 373.) 'They were blamed by many for not maturing their plan with sufficient wisdom, for acting with precipitation, and especially for not consulting the bishops and insuring their patronage.' Bogue and Bennet, ii. 464.

emolument. Within the last two reigns, it was remarked, nonconformity had taken a much wider range; Arian and Socinian tenets having rendered many of its adherents incapable of subscribing even to the doctrinal portion of the thirty-nine articles.¹ These arguments would have had even still greater weight, if the statutable subscriptions had been then regularly enforced. But, in reality, subscription had become rare among dissenting ministers; and attempts to enforce it, still more so. Nor did such of them as held opinions excepted out of the Act of Toleration, fail of finding sufficient shelter under the prevailing indisposition to interfere with religious belief in any case. When, accordingly, it came to a division, the petition found only seventy-one supporters: against it were two hundred and seventeen.²

§ 21. This disappointment was, however, somewhat lightened to the dissenting body, by the admission that it was hard upon their ministers even to be under a statutable liability to subscription, notwithstanding the practical exemption usually enjoyed. No time, accordingly, was lost in petitioning for the abolition of such liability. Sir Henry Houghton, the representative of a very old and respectable dissenting family in Lancashire, brought this petition into parliament. It was resisted, as coming with a very ill grace from a body of men who habitually disregarded the law of subscription, and with impunity, just after a similar application had been refused from another class of petitioners, who were kept strictly within the law. Much was also said upon the danger of leaving a door legally open for the dissemination of opinions, not only hostile to the church, but also to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, especially at a time when such impiety had become alarmingly prevalent. The Commons, however, passed the bill by a great majority: but the bishops opposed it most strenuously, and hence it was lost in the Lords, by a majority of a hundred and two against twenty-nine.³ The measure had, however, gained such an advantage in the lower house, that its friends were naturally sanguine of ultimate success. Hence, in the next year, it was introduced again, but with the same results,—favourable reception by the Commons, rejection by the Lords.⁴ The question now slumbered in Parliament for a time, but the press resounded with it; Socinian pens taking the lead. Writers of this class, however, gave offence to those dissenters who had no quarrel with the doctrinal articles, but only with an authoritative call to

¹ [Most of the old Presbyterians became Unitarians about the middle of the eighteenth century. The change was silently effected, the ministers going first; in some instances their flocks followed them, in others they united themselves with the Congregationalists. The legal representatives of the old Presbyterians are generally Unitarian. *Ed.*]

² Bisset's *George III.* ii. 36.

³ Bogue and Bennet, ii. 465.

[⁴ Upon this occasion it was, that the great

earl of Chatham, answering Drummond, archbishop of York, who had attacked the Dissenters with more zeal than discretion, uttered the language often cited since: 'We have a Calvinistic creed, a Popish liturgy, and an Arminian clergy.' If political orators came to religious discussion with more accuracy of preparation than they commonly use, the temptation to utter this, and many other things equally effective, would have been resisted.

affirm them, by the prominence given to their peculiar opinions, and by the contumacious treatment of orthodox dissent as the blind prejudice of unenlightened minds. In return for this insulting assumption of superiority, some of the Dissenters became unwilling to make further application for relief, feeling themselves practically under no grievance, and considering the desired indulgence as likely to be abused by bolder attempts than ever to undermine the vitals of Christianity. Still, by these literary efforts, the question was kept alive in the country; and being again brought before parliament by Sir Henry Houghton, in 1779, it passed both houses with very little opposition.¹ Thus dissenters were excused from any further liability to a call for subscription to any of the thirty-nine articles.

§ 22. When the question of subscription first gained legislative notice, the old project of a *Comprehension* was again under discussion. Hopes of accomplishing it had been entertained both among churchmen and dissenters, under the primacy of archbishop Herring, several years before; and Doddridge was among those who thought it feasible and desirable.² It was revived in 1772, some clergymen who subsequently rose high in their profession being among its abettors.³ A petition, stating their views, was presented to archbishop Cornwallis, who then held the see of Canterbury, and he returned an answer to it, on the 11th of February, 1773. This stated, that after consultations with various members of the episcopal bench, it had been decided, that any attempt to revise the liturgy and articles would be imprudent.⁴ Such an attempt must obviously have been attended with great delicacy and difficulty, especially under the practical abeyance to which Convocation had been so long reduced. It would have been certain, also, to disappoint its friends, both by the multiplicity of demands made, and the impossibility that must soon have manifested itself, of annihilating dissent by almost any latitude of concession.

§ 23. But although the dissenters gained relief from a liability to a call for subscription, they were not able, within the eighteenth century, to accomplish the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts. The attempt was first made in 1787, but both Lord North and Mr. Pitt resisted it; hence it failed.⁵ The petitioners were generally spoken of in very respectful terms, but it was denied that they lay under any practical hardship, nothing more being done in their disfavour by the State, than a declaration on its part of certain terms on which it thought offices of honour and trust might be safely laid open. Undiscouraged by this refusal, a similar application was made in 1789, and though unsuccessful, the majority unfavourable to it was much smaller than on the former occasion.⁶ This was hailed as a favourable omen by the dissenting body; and it now called upon

¹ Bogue and Bennet, ii. 470.

² Philip's *Whitefield and his Times*, 252.

³ As Porteus, Yorke, and Percy, afterwards severally bishops of London, Ely, and Dromore.

⁴ Cardwell's *History of Conferences*, 460.

⁵ The ayes were 100, noes 178. Bogue and Bennet, ii. 478.

⁶ Ayes, 102; noes, 122. *Ibid.*

its members in the country to join in those applications for relief, which had hitherto come chiefly from London: a circumstance that gave rise to some remarks prejudicial to the motion. But this appeal to rural nonconformity proved injurious to the immediate fulfilment of dissenting expectations, however it might have ultimately tended to realise them, by giving to the body a compact political form. A considerable degree of intemperance made its appearance, and had immediately the natural effect of producing exasperation on the other side. Acrimonious pamphlets kept up the strife; so that men became less capable of taking a calm view of the question than they had been for many years.¹ Hence, when it came again before the House of Commons, in 1790, one of the fullest assembled for a long time, it was rejected by an overwhelming majority.² Two years later, Mr. Fox would have placed those who denied the divinity of Christ as completely within the Toleration Act as other dissenters. But Mr. Pitt opposed the extension, as really unnecessary; the parties to be benefited by it receiving practically the same exemption that all other religionists enjoyed, however the letter of the law might place them in a different situation. He urged also, particularly, the irritation generally prevalent, as a reason why a concession, which had little more than a theoretical importance, should not be forced upon an unwilling nation. The public mind was violently excited by French revolutionary politics; and as these were daily losing popularity, yet were very much in favour with Socinians, it seemed far from prudent to encourage their sect by any needless indulgence. The motion, accordingly, was lost.³

§ 24. During all the earlier years of the eighteenth century, the English Romanists were in a situation precarious indeed, from the rigour of persecuting statutes, but endurable, from the increasing liberality of the times. They entered upon the century with a most uncomfortable prospect; an act having been passed in the year 1699, which each party in parliament would have gladly seen thrown out by its opponents, and which rendered Romish landlords, refusing to take the test, liable to forfeit their estates to the next protestant heir, besides providing intolerable hardships for their priests. This act, however, served for little else than to disgrace the statute-book, and make the proscribed religionists tremble for their possessions, or, if priests, for their personal liberties. These evils were, however, aggravated by an act passed in the first year of George I., which authorised any two justices to tender the oaths of allegiance, supremacy, and abjuration, to persons suspected of disaffection to the government, visiting a refusal to take them with all the penalties of recusancy. This new offence was called *constructive recusancy*; and if the government had not been desirous of overlooking the offenders, Romanists would have found themselves in a worse condition than ever. Yet, for all this practical lenity, Walpole, in 1722, raised one

¹ Bogue and Bennet, ii. 479.

² Ayes, 105; noes, 294. *Ibid.* 480.

³ By 79 votes. *Ibid.* 482.

hundred thousand pounds, by act of parliament, on the estates of papists and non-jurors: the liberal connivance of his government not being proof against the temptation of an important pecuniary relief from a gross extortion upon parties utterly defenceless, because generally unpopular. Under George II. no new law was enacted against Romanists; his being the first reign since the Reformation so advantageously distinguished. George the Third's reign opened upon them under auspices still more favourable. The principles of toleration had been advocated by several master-minds; the disciples of Hoadly universally admitted its justice; Blackburne, although intolerant towards Romanists, on the ground of their own intolerance towards all other Christians, yet raised a controversy that, however contemptible it might be on many accounts, filled men's minds with speculations upon religious liberty. The sovereign, too, possessed advantages which were altogether above those of his Hanoverian predecessors. He was no foreigner, ignorant of the English language, like George I.; or speaking it as one who learnt it late and imperfectly, like George II.; his prepossessions were not all German, and Hanover was not the constant scene of his regrets, the engrossing object for aggrandisement; he was not constantly disquieted by fears of a popish pretender to his throne; on the contrary, the unfortunate prince who had made an alarming descent upon Scotland in the time of his grandfather, was now known to be personally contemptible; and hence hardly any ever dreamt of seeing him invested with British royalty. Thus English Romanism was placed in a much more promising position than it had ever occupied since the expulsion of James II. It gained also something of a favourable hearing in the royal family, through the noble house of Norfolk, which judiciously improved opportunities of ingratiating itself with Frederic, prince of Wales, during his disagreement with George II. No sooner, too, had Lord Mansfield become chief-justice, than he discouraged, by every possible means, any prosecution that might occasionally come before him under the penal laws, giving to the party brought in question the utmost benefit that his legal knowledge could suggest, and speaking on all occasions most advantageously of religious toleration. The immediate cause, however, of a solid improvement in the condition of Romish families, was of a private nature. A lady had a jointure rent-charge on an estate, possessed by a person to whom she had shown great kindness; he refused to pay it, alleging her disability to retain any interest in land, as being a Roman catholic. Every lawyer told her that this infamous refusal must stand good, unless a private act were passed for her relief.¹ This was done; and men were naturally driven by such a transaction to think upon the iniquity of suffering acts even to slumber any longer in the statute-book, which might be so shamefully awakened at any time by avarice or malice. Hence a motion made by Sir George Saville, on the 14th of May, 1778, for

¹ Butler's *Hist. Mem. of the Engl. Cath.* ii. 72.

the repeal of the disabilities so strangely and unexpectedly enacted against Romanists, near the conclusion of William's reign,¹ passed both houses without a division. This act did not extend to Scotland;² but a wide prevailing wish that it should, and some movements for that purpose, awakened a violent spirit of intolerance; and some serious riots in Edinburgh, with others less important in Glasgow, were the result. These were the precursors of similar excesses, but upon a much broader scale, in London, in 1780. Lord George Gordon, a junior of the ducal house of that name, but otherwise personally insignificant in every point of view, had connected himself with the violent anti-Romish party in his own country; and being a member of the House of Commons, he was easily enabled to arouse a kindred spirit in the populace of London. The infuriate mob commenced with assaults upon property of every description that could be connected with popery; but it soon manifested all the features essential to such assemblages, whatever be the object of their meeting—wanton destruction, lust of plunder, and sympathy for criminals. London continued several days in a state of extreme danger and alarm, every inhabitant trembling who had anything to lose: no sooner, however, did the military act, than peace was restored. Hence it was plainly shown that religious fanaticism was rather a pretext for the outrage, than really a cause of it, there being nothing solid to sustain the rioters: had not, accordingly, the civic authorities been bewildered by an unmanly panic, there is every reason to believe, that the popular violence might have been curbed, without any great difficulty, and before any very extensive damage had been done.

§ 25. The English Romanists having obtained relief from some of the most iniquitous penalties by which they were menaced in the statute-book, naturally looked forward to further improvements in their condition. They did not, however, long trust to the gradual amelioration of public opinion, and its necessary effect upon the legislature. They formed a committee, in 1787, for the furtherance of their objects: a measure that might aid success, but certainly tended to make their body something of a political party. In February, 1788, this committee presented to the celebrated William Pitt, then prime minister, a memorial detailing the hardships of themselves and their friends, as a preliminary to an application for

¹ 'By the act in question, popish priests or Jesuits, found to officiate in the service of the Romish church, incurred the penalties of felony, if foreigners; and of high treason, if natives: the successions of popish heirs educated abroad were forfeited, and their estates descended to the next protestant heir: a son, or other nearest protestant relation, might take possession of the estate of a father, or other next kinsman of the popish persuasion, during the life of the real proprietor: papists were prevented from acquiring any legal property by *purchase*, a term which in law included every

mode of acquiring property but descent; and thus the various sources of acquisition were shut up from the Roman catholics. The mildness of the government had softened the rigour of the law; but it was to be remembered, that popish priests constantly lay at the mercy of the basest of mankind, common informers. On the evidence of any of these wretches, the magisterial and judicial powers were necessitated to enforce all the shameful penalties of the act.' Bisset's *George III.* ii. 397.

Butler, ii. 447.

parliamentary relief. The premier was found highly favourable, but expressed fears as to the pope's presumed power of deposing princes, and other anti-social principles, popularly fastened upon Romanism. In consequence, inquiries were transmitted to the universities of Paris, Louvain, Douay, Alcalà, and Salamanca, to know whether these exceptional doctrines really were integral portions of the Romish faith.¹ Negative answers were returned, as might have been foreseen; it being impossible to find these obnoxious articles among the main landmarks of papal theology, though easy to find such authority for them as would reconcile most minds to their use in confession, and in private society; the English Romanists, however, solemnly renounced them in a long protestation, prepared about the close of 1788, and which was signed by nearly all their body of any note, both clerical and lay, throughout England. At a general meeting in London, in 1789, every person present signed it. In the very words of this protestation, an oath was framed, when Romish claims for relief again came before parliament; but the ministry made some alterations in it, and these were at first deemed admissible even by the ecclesiastical members of the Romish committee. Subsequently, objections were made to them, and, to meet these, it was eventually altered. All who took it were to be relieved from certain penal statutes. This wise and just relaxation received parliamentary sanction in 1791; numbering amongst its most active supporters the illustrious bishop Horsley.² It abrogated the statutes of recusancy, tolerated Romish chapels and schools, removed liability to be called upon to take the oath of supremacy, or to make the declaration against transubstantiation, allowed Romanists to practise as barristers or attorneys, and freed them from several vexatious restrictions of less importance. At the same time, they were exempted from another grievance, in the omission of a clause making them pay double land-tax, in the bill annually imposing that tax.³ They were, in fact, now placed as to religious toleration, and as to fiscal contributions, though not as to political rights, very much upon a level with all other Englishmen.

§ 26. The Irish Romanists had been reduced, by various confiscations, and by intolerant statutes to protect a new race of proprietors, to a state of abject vassalage and degradation. In the reign of James I. the whole province of Ulster was confiscated. When Cromwell's power was consolidated by victory, the native Irish received orders to remove into Connaught, and were forbidden to repass the Shannon under pain of death. Their estates were divided among the conquerors, as were those of every one who had been engaged in the rebellion, or who had acted as a partisan of the exiled royal family. This immense mass of landed property was partly assigned, in satisfaction of arrears of pay, to Cromwell's officers and soldiers; partly

¹ The queries and answers may be seen in the first volume of the late Mr. Butler's *Historical Memoirs*, p. 402, *et seq.*

² Bisset, iv. 325.

³ Butler, ii. 135.

to certain moneyed men, who had advanced funds for the prosecution of the war. Such assignments received parliamentary sanction, after the Restoration; and thus two millions seven hundred thousand acres were legally conveyed from their late hereditary owners to a new class of proprietors. It was impossible that men, exasperated by a reduction to beggary so recent, to say nothing of religious prejudice, should not eagerly have crowded round the standard of James II. The unfortunate issue of their attempt involved them in final ruin. One million sixty thousand seven hundred and ninety-two acres were now confiscated. This property was sold, under authority of the English parliament, to defray the expenses incurred in the late rebellion. By these repeated and enormous confiscations, the whole mass of Irish landed inheritances has passed by violence to new proprietors, with the exception of some estates possessed by five or six families of English descent. Even among these there had been attainders under Henry VIII., but their estates were subsequently recovered, and the owners, made wise by the lesson taught in that monarch's reign, steered clear of danger afterwards.¹ In these transactions, however cruel and shameful they may be thought, or may really be, there is nothing worse than England underwent after the Norman conquest, or than has been undergone by other conquered countries: but in Ireland there were circumstances that prevented the gradual amalgamation of the pillaged and the pillagers; the former were, perhaps, universally Romanists, hence divided from those who had been made rich at their expense, by an inveterate religious prejudice, and furnished with a priesthood of their own, directed by a compact hierarchy, which not only kept alive an enthusiastic religious party-spirit, but also pertinacious claims to the forfeited estates. The new proprietors were thus never at ease as to the firmness of their possession, and their legislation showed it. William's parliament, accordingly, in addition to the English enactments against Romanists, disarmed them, banished their priests, forbade their marriages with protestants, would not allow them to act as solicitors, or even as game-keepers, and allowed any protestant discoverer of a horse in their hands, or power, to seize it under a magisterial warrant, and retain it on the payment of five pounds to its owner. Under Anne, Romanists were disabled from purchasing any of the forfeited lands, and even from taking any leases of them beyond two acres. They were also rendered unable to purchase, inherit, or take by gift, any lands in the hands of protestants; and all their own lands were made descendible in gavelkind: but if the eldest son embraced the established religion, his father was reduced to a tenancy for life, without power to sell or mortgage, or even to provide, except under the control of the chancellor, for his younger children. A similar invasion upon domestic comfort was made by another act, which enabled the chancellor to call upon the Romish parent of a protestant child to declare upon oath the value of his

¹ Butler, ii. 434.

whole property, and to make such an assignment out of it to the protestant child, as he should think proper. The conforming wife of a Romanist might also obtain from the chancellor, as a jointure, the full extent of any settlement that her husband could make upon her.¹ These, with other such measures, designed for extermination, reduced the Romanists to such a pitiable situation, that common feelings of humanity came to their relief, and a general spirit of connivance was excited among the protestant population, which made much of the penal code little else than a dead letter. It tended, however, so thoroughly to degrade and impoverish the Irish papists, that neither in 1715, nor in 1745, did the exiled Romish family find any encouragement among them; an abstinence that has been represented as a proof of their blameless political bearing, but which seems rather to show a stagnant feeling of utter helplessness.² As years, however, rolled on, their prospects brightened. The people had never stood high in the scale of civilisation, and, therefore, could easily rest contented with gratifications merely animal. Hence, as the country was quiet, population advanced with extraordinary rapidity. Some of the inferior classes naturally acquired property by the ordinary exercise of industry. These, with a miserable fraction of the old Romish proprietary body, being backed by a large and increasing populace, gradually formed an important section in the insular society. The just claims of this, not only to greater practical indulgence, but also to the abrogation of those odious penalties by which it was menaced in the statute-book, were necessarily much aided in their operation upon society by the more enlightened views of religious liberty which daily gained ground in every quarter. The first movement, however, in its favour appears to have come from a Romish committee; one of those combinations that may serve a cause, but may also injure it, by suggesting an adverse association, and give an edge to party rancour, that it must have wanted without the stimulus, boldness, and publicity of numbers. The Irish committee's earnest of ultimate success, was an act passed in 1774, prescribing an oath of allegiance, to be taken by Romanists, if they chose, but offering no specific advantage from it. Most of them of any account took it, and thus gave a solemn approval to the existing government. Such persons, in 1778, were enabled to hold leases for nine hundred and ninety-nine years, or for lives not exceeding five. They were also placed upon a level with other people as to the devising, transfer, inheritance, and holding of lands. In 1782 this measure of substantial relief was followed by others, which enabled Romanists to purchase lands, though not advowsons; freed from penalties those of their clergy who should register their names, and allowed them to teach schools. By the more intelligent protestants, these indulgences were viewed with great satisfaction. Fears of a French invasion had caused an immense armament of volunteers in Ireland, blending members of the two religions together,

¹ Butler, ii. 141; iv. 492.

² 'We look upon the Catholics to be altogether as inconsiderable as the women and

the children.' Swift, *apud* Butler, *ibid.* iv. 505.

as defenders of their common country. It was this formidable array of an independent military power, that stripped the island pretty completely of its colonial character. The English government could no longer treat the country as a mere distant province of no great importance, after its resources were thus completely and formidably developed. Of the great armed association which so raised its country in the estimation of British statesmen, the representatives of one hundred and forty-three protestant corps met at Dungannon, in February, 1782. These delegates resolved, with only two dissentients, that private judgment in matters of religion was a natural right; hence, that late relaxations of the penal code against Romanists were subjects of national congratulation, and were likely to prove highly beneficial. By the prevalence of such liberal views, Romish hopes were necessarily raised, and various negotiations for further indulgences were set on foot; but nothing was effected until 1793, when an act was passed, which placed Irish Romanists in the position that they occupied until 1829,¹ denying them seats in Parliament, but otherwise leaving them under no substantial hardships. From their remaining disqualifications, earl Fitzwilliam would have relieved them, while he was lord-lieutenant in 1795, but his measures were deemed injudicious, and he was hastily recalled before the object was effected. In 1798 the Irish rebellion broke out, which discovered a rancorous hatred of the protestant name highly injurious to the confidence of those who bear it, in their Romish countrymen.² The disorders of that year, however, made the English government meditate upon the expediency of attaching the Roman Catholic priesthood to the state, by means of a parliamentary provision, and a secret negotiation was accordingly entered upon, in 1799, with the prelacy for that purpose; the proffered bounty was to be made contingent upon a privilege secured for the crown of annulling the appointment of any prelate deemed objectionable.³ This privilege, termed the *veto*, was conceded by the four Romish archbishops, and the six senior bishops, after the deliberation of three successive days, on the ninth day immediately following. The transaction, however, failed, and did not become publicly known until 1805, when it was absurdly said, that the *veto* had been conceded by the Irish prelates from intimidation: an assertion positively denied by lord Castlereagh, who had negotiated with them.⁴

§ 27. In Scotland, popular abhorrence of Romanism had been pushed to greater lengths than in any other portion of the British isles, and in consequence, that religion had been very widely exterminated there. Nevertheless, there were families that continued in it, under every discouragement, and in some remote quarters of the Highlands the population generally had done so. All these parties were highly obnoxious to every government but Anne's, established since the revolution, from their devoted adherence to the exiled

¹ Butler, ii. 516.

² Collins, 241.

³ The resolutions of the Roman Catholic

Irish prelates may be seen in Mr. Butler's *Historical Memoirs*, ii. 150.

⁴ *Ibid*, 154.

Stuarts, who were at once loved as compatriots, and venerated as martyrs to the Romish faith. Hence the Scottish papists lay under all the rigour of penal statutes. By an act of their native parliament, passed under William, they were liable to be called upon to take a test, known in the country as the *Formula*, which is an explicit renunciation of all the peculiarities in their creed.¹ Any landowner refusing to make this declaration, might be stripped of his estate by the next protestant heir. There was actually a suit depending in the Scottish courts, under this very law, in the early part of 1793. A gentleman of great respectability was then in danger of losing by that means a landed property of 1,000*l.* a year. The courts, indignant at the mercenary attempt of an unfeeling relative, thus to seize a possession for which he had no equitable claim, were evading this discreditable endeavour to revive a law almost obsolete, by giving every facility to the unfortunate Romanist's measures for self-protection. But the avaricious suitor must, at length, have been gratified by a decision, unless the obnoxious statute should be repealed. For this, as the eighteenth century drew towards a close, the nation generally became fully ripe. A bill was accordingly brought into the British parliament, in April, 1793, by the lord-advocate of Scotland, for exempting his Romish countrymen from the penalties to which their peculiar opinions rendered them liable.² It had the concurrence of all parties, and passed without opposition. Thus, in each of the three kingdoms, Romanism was now fully tolerated, and public opinion went heartily with the tardy concession.

§ 28. The preceding year had relieved the protestant episcopal church of Scotland from legal proscription. It was overthrown under William by the dexterous management of political partisans, with no real appearance of that prevailing hostility to it which had been assigned as the cause of its ruin. On the contrary, most people north of the Tay were episcopalians, as was the majority of individuals in superior life all over the kingdom. The universities too were generally on the same side, as were many of the most substantial traders, and even the bulk of the population in those counties round Edinburgh, which form the best part of the whole country. It was only in the south-western counties, which had been the great theatre of Cameronian fanaticism, that any violent antipathy to an episcopal polity was generally prevalent. Thus the majority was deprived of its religious institutions upon representations, palpably unsound, made by an active and factious minority to a government which it had zealously supported. The despoiled majority, however, could not be expected to look with a friendly eye upon the government which had so hastily listened to the adverse party: the manner, too, in which this great national change was carried into execution, could not fail of augmenting disaffection to the government in those who suffered by it. In the new settlement none were to be admitted as incumbents but such as were actually in possession on the 13th of April,

¹ Printed by Mr. Butler, *Historical Memoirs*, ii. 459.

² *Ibid.* 465.

1689. This provision was construed so as to exclude about two hundred unfortunate clergymen in the west, who had been expelled by a Cameronian rabble in the preceding winter from their livings and homes. These ill-used men were described, in a subsequent act of parliament, as persons who had either deserted their churches, or been removed from them. The Duke of Hamilton, commenting indignantly upon such a shameful abuse of language in the national records, asks, how could desertion be charged upon individuals who were notoriously driven away by the most barbarous violence, and what could *removed* mean but *rabbled*? A mode of making way for presbyterian incumbents, little less unjust, was found in a proclamation, circulated just before, for prayers on a certain day in all churches for William and Mary, as king and queen. Yet the crown of Scotland had not then been offered to these royal personages: their acceptance of it, in fact, was a month later. Thus clergymen were universally called upon, with hardly any notice, to commit themselves before their congregations, upon a great constitutional question, which the civil authorities of the country had not hitherto formally decided. It is no wonder that some ministers hesitated, and that others positively refused until time was given for consideration. Most of those, however, who did not read the proclamation on the specified day, were stripped of their preferments. Another engine for the ejection of episcopalian incumbents was the placing of them in the power of such ministers as had been themselves ejected subsequently to the 1st of January, 1661. About sixty of these were still alive, and to give authority into such hands over the once triumphant episcopalians, was obviously nothing else than to bar the door against mercy or concession. These rigorous and violent spirits, who entered upon their new authority with an indignant sense of the hardships that they had undergone when vanquished and oppressed, soon made an effectual clearance of their opponents by arrangements to try and purge out all insufficient, negligent, scandalous, and erroneous ministers. Nothing was easier with men of sour tempers, austere morals, irritated feelings, and an overweening conceit of their own theology, than to bring such as thought differently under one of these descriptions, if not under all of them. By these various devices, therefore, the episcopalian clergy were rapidly deprived; but so glaring was the injustice inflicted on them, that William, greatly as he feared their power, became ashamed of his instruments to overthrow it, and anxious to curb their abuse of authority. The injury was, however, done, and past remedy; still it left a sore and angry feeling deeply seated in the large party which had suffered under it, and which will account for much of that hostility to the revolution settlement, so long prevailing among the Scottish episcopalians. Their clergy were, indeed, actually brought under the lash of a test which presbyterians refused. An act was passed requiring an acknowledgment on oath of William and Mary, as sovereigns *de jure*, as well as *de facto*, and binding the party to the most unqualified renunciation of James's claims. The established clergy could not stomach

the solemn affirmation of such principles, and however gratifying their acceptance of them might have been to William, he prudently recalled the instructions originally given for insisting upon it. But no such recall was in store for the prostrate episcopalians, and accordingly this very test, which their more fortunate rivals repudiated, removed some of them who had hitherto retained possession. The deprived clergymen, however, thought themselves at least so far protected by the example of their presbyterian brethren, as to be excusable in celebrating divine worship at their own homes, with open doors. But a list of such offenders was transmitted to the privy council, and two of them were banished from their respective dwellings. The severest blow levelled at the proscribed priesthood was an act of parliament, passed in 1695, which forbade 'any outed minister to baptize any children, or solemnise marriage betwixt any parties in all time coming, under pain of imprisonment, until he find caution to go out of the kingdom, and never to return thereto.' Under Anne, the prospects of Scottish episcopacy rather brightened, but an attempt to carry a parliamentary toleration of all protestants excited a clamour so violent, that its friends abandoned it. Nevertheless, the general predilection for episcopacy that prevailed in upper life, joined to an extensive preference for it in lower, prevented its friends from despairing, and they now identified themselves more completely with their southern brethren, by adopting the English Liturgy. Their position was, however, suddenly rendered worse by the political agitation that pervaded Scotland when the project for a legislative union with England was on foot. The presbyterian party became apprehensive that it would no longer be an overmatch for the native gentry, when they should become politically united with the aristocracy of South Britain. To allay the ferment occasioned by such alarms, an arbitrary order unexpectedly came down from court, for the closing of all episcopal chapels. As this tyrannical mandate was the mere creature of temporary expediency, its rigour appears to have been quickly relaxed, and within two years afterwards there were thirteen episcopal congregations assembled in Edinburgh. Violent presbyterians became uneasy at such a spectacle, and interpreting the articles of union in the narrowest spirit of intolerance, the presbytery of Edinburgh prosecuted an Irish clergyman for opening a small episcopal chapel in that city, and the magistrates committed him to prison, where he was detained several months. This flagrant intolerance was obviously insufferable, and accordingly, an act was passed in the British parliament, in 1712, to protect Scottish episcopalians in their public worship, baptisms, and marriages. The Whig ministry, however, which obtained office on the accession of George I., immediately awakened the fears of the episcopal party in North Britain, by issuing a proclamation to put the laws in force against all papists, non-jurors, and disaffected persons. A body that knew itself to be menaced in this denunciation, could not fail of supplying adherents to the old pretender, in the rebellion of 1715. No new hardship, however, seems to have been

inflicted on the episcopal church of Scotland, until 1719, when an act was passed rendering such of its clergy liable to an imprisonment of six months, as did not pray for King George and the royal family by name. As usual with measures of extreme severity, this act soon became very much of a dead letter, and although the royal family was not usually introduced by name into episcopal chapels, yet their number was considerable, and the congregations assembled in them embraced members from every rank in the community. While thus maintaining their opinions in peace and respectability, the young pretender's attempt in 1745 placed them in a worse condition than ever. Their chapels were destroyed by lawless violence, and any valuable effects found in them appropriated by the mob or soldiery. An act of parliament was next passed, which provided, that 'from and after the 1st of September, 1746, every person exercising the function of a pastor or minister in any episcopal meeting-house in Scotland, without registering his letters of orders, and taking all the oaths required by law, and praying for his majesty, King George, and the royal family by name, shall, for the first offence, suffer an imprisonment of six months, and for the second, be transported to some one of his majesty's plantations for life.' A congregation of five persons was made sufficient to render any house a meeting-house, and no letters of orders were to be registered after the 1st of September, unless given by some English or Irish bishop. Moreover, every person present at an illegal episcopal meeting-house, and not giving notice to a magistrate, within five days afterwards, was to incur fine and imprisonment; presence, likewise, twice within a year, was to disqualify a peer from being one of the sixteen representatives of his body, and from voting for any such representative; and a commoner from a seat in the lower house, and from voting for a member of parliament. As all the episcopal clergy of Scotland were not Jacobites, some of them now came forward, took the oaths required by law, and registered their letters of orders before the prescribed 1st of September. This compliance might seem to have been displeasing to the party in power, and that nothing short of the extinction of the Scottish episcopal church, as a national body, would satisfy it. An act, accordingly, was passed in May, 1748, which declared 'that no letters of orders not granted by some bishop of the church of England, or of Ireland, should, after the 29th of September, be sufficient to qualify any pastor or minister of any episcopal meeting in Scotland, whether the same had been registered before or since the 1st of September, 1746; and that every such registration, whether made before or since, should be null and void.' This infamous stretch of intolerance passed the Commons with little opposition, but in the Lords, as every bishop opposed it, some of the bench with speeches besides votes, the chancellor, Hardwick, had a hard matter to carry it through with a majority of five. In Scotland its victims were sorely distressed. Some clergymen were imprisoned, others retired into England, and others again sought religious liberty, with a maintenance for themselves and their families, by emigration

to North America. Their national church, however, still was proof against the spirit which sought its extinction. The chapel, indeed, was no longer to be seen, but a few worshippers who clung to the liturgy and the ecclesiastical polity cherished by their fathers, assembled stealthily in obscure garrets, or other sequestered places. Thus the national succession was kept up, and when a disposition awoke to treat Scottish episcopacy with common justice, neither its hierarchy nor subordinate priesthood was found to be extinct. Its emergence from the long persecution that it had undergone was not complete until the young pretender's death in 1788. Then George III. was introduced into the liturgy in every Scottish chapel except three. Four years afterwards, the intolerant acts of 1746 and 1748 were repealed, and complete toleration was granted to the Scottish episcopalians, on condition that their clergy should pray for the king and royal family by name, as prescribed in the English Liturgy, take the oaths taken by officers both civil and military, and subscribe the Thirty-nine articles of the Church of England.¹

§ 29. A circumstance that forcibly drew the attention of English episcopalians to their persecuted and struggling brethren in Scotland, was the consecration of an American bishop by the prelate of the oppressed Scottish church. The first European colonists who took root in that noble territory, which was once British North America, and which now forms the United States, were Protestant episcopalians. They were a small band of Englishmen, who landed at Cape Henry, in Virginia, on the 26th of April, 1607, bringing over as their chaplain, Robert Hunt, an exemplary Kentish clergyman, whose appointment had been approved by archbishop Bancroft. Before the close of 1620, however, a small band of English Puritans landed at Cape Cod, in New England, and, after undergoing extreme hardships, formed a settlement which attracted, during several years, great numbers of discontented Englishmen. Thus was formed a large American community rancorously hostile to everything savouring of prelacy. But a different spirit kept possession of the south; where the want of a bishop for ordination, confirmation, and ecclesiastical superintendence, became generally acknowledged. Queen Anne's government was duly alive to such calls; hence, that princess meant a sum of eighty thousand pounds, coming to her from the sale of lands at St. Christopher's, ceded to Britain at the peace of Utrecht, as an endowment for four bishoprics in the North American colonies. Her death happening before that design was carried into execution, and the Whig ministry that gained exclusive possession of power being chiefly intent upon strengthening its position, the surrender of a large sum to a purpose purely ecclesiastical was entirely out of the question. The whole of this money was, in fact, eventually given to the princess Anne, on her marriage with the prince of Orange.²

¹ These particulars are wholly taken from Dr. Russell's *Hist. of the Ch. in Scotl.* ii. p. 356 *et seq.*

² *Life of Samuel Johnson, D.D., first President of King's College, New York*, p. 53, Lond. 1824.

But although such transactions may retard a great measure, they generally render its ultimate success more certain, by infusing into sober convictions the pungency of disgust and indignation. The cause of American episcopacy, accordingly, was constantly on the advance, in spite of indifferent or hostile ministries at home. It even took root in New England, where a favourable soil was least to be expected. As the generations wore away that had been driven from their paternal land by irreconcilable antipathy to her ecclesiastical institutions, the personal feelings which were brought from Europe, became in a great measure forgotten, and the descendants of these unbending Puritans could enter upon ecclesiastical questions with the patient calmness of mere inquirers after truth. Seven young ministers, accordingly, after much thought and reading, confounded the trustees of a New England college, in 1722, by declaring against their Presbyterian ordination. Some of them professed doubts of its validity; others absolutely pronounced it invalid. Three of these revolters from Presbytery went over immediately into England, for episcopal ordination, and one of them, Samuel Johnson, on his return to New England, became considerably successful in rooting church principles in that country.¹ His interesting visit to Europe and subsequent correspondence with the English hierarchy, naturally brought the subject of American episcopacy continually before those who took an interest in religious questions. Archbishop Secker, especially, was very anxious to see bishops established in North America, and his feelings were shared by the most distinguished of his brethren. The government, however, continued averse; and its hostility was fortified by the large Dissenting party which formed an active majority in the colonies. This not only hated prelacy from old antipathies and settled opinions, but also began to dread its increasing attractions for the population around. Its friends, however, on both sides of the Atlantic, were not idle, and their object seemed rather likely to be carried in the early part of George III.'s reign. But the political agitation that ushered in the American war, and subsequently that war itself, gave a new direction to the public mind,

¹ Johnson was made Master of Arts by diploma, by the university of Oxford, during his visit to England for ordination, May 21, 1723. The same university made him D.D. by diploma, Feb. 13, 1743. He was the first president of King's College, New York, established in 1754. His masculine sense received its earliest objection to sectarian worship from the vanity which extemporary praying raised among his fellow-students when at college, and the impertinences which they introduced into their prayers. Of the church of England and her liturgy, he knew hardly anything until 1716, when he was twenty. A Prayer-book was then put into his hands, and he was delighted with it. When he began to officiate, accordingly, as a dissenting minister, he framed

his own public prayers chiefly out of the liturgy. This was, of course, unknown to his congregation, which retained all the old puritanical aversion for the church, and hence Johnson's prayers were so highly admired, that out-parishioners commonly came to hear them. When he was going over for episcopal ordination, he told his people of the source from which he had drawn his admired prayers. They were greatly surprised, but only four or five of them could be reconciled to the church. Their unconscious admiration of her formularies could not, however, fail of being remembered in her favour. Dr. Johnson died with the highest reputation, Jan. 6, 1772.—*Life of Dr. Johnson*, 32, 124.

and rendered even the episcopalians in the colonies averse from any measure in the least resembling a new tie with the mother-country. When independence had been secured, some of this feeling naturally ceased; and with greater freedom from passion, came a sense of the inconveniences to which episcopacy in the states had now become subject. Before the war of independence, those extensive territories had been considered as an appendage to the diocese of London, and a commissary from the bishop of that see transacted their ecclesiastical business. This arrangement, always unsatisfactory,¹ was now obviously unsuitable, and even impracticable; hence the North American episcopalians became more anxious than ever for an episcopate of their own. This desire first produced a practical result in Connecticut, where the clergy elected for their bishop Samuel Seabury, son of a New England Presbyterian, who had gone over to the church. The object of their choice was himself an Oxford doctor in divinity by diploma, an honour conferred in 1777, for services to the episcopal cause in his own country. With proper credentials and ample testimonials he came to London, in 1784, and solicited episcopal consecration. His application was highly agreeable to the English bishops, but they considered themselves disqualified from gratifying him by a statutable obligation to administer the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, which the recent independence of his country no longer allowed him to take. There was, indeed, neither indisposition to seek parliamentary sanction for such a consecration as that now desired, nor doubt as to the passing of an enabling act, but these formalities required more time than could conveniently be spared. Under this difficulty, Seabury was recommended to request consecration from the depressed and almost forgotten prelates of Scotland. They were perfectly willing to gratify him; but the abject condition to which they were reduced, by the penal laws of 1746 and 1748, rendered them apprehensive of undertaking any consecration, originally contemplated by the archbishop of Canterbury, until it had been ascertained how far such a step would be agreeable in England. A correspondence being opened for this purpose, the Scottish prelacy was assured, that a compliance with Seabury's wishes, instead of offending the English bishops, would give them a more favourable opinion of their northern brethren. In consequence, the North American candidate for an episcopal commission received one at Aberdeen, at the hands of three Scottish prelates, on the 14th of November, 1784.² Early in the following summer, the new bishop landed again in his native country, where he was well received, and thus Connecticut was regularly placed under a bishop of its own. Other portions of the Union, however, had no such advantage; and, although they had nothing to allege against the validity of the new prelate's consecration, yet there was little disposition to pay him any

¹ 'I think myself at present in a very bad situation, bishop of a vast country, without power or influence, or any means of promoting true religion, sequestered from the

people over whom I have the care, and must never hope to see.' Bp. Sherlock to Dr. Johnson, April 21, 1752, *Ibid.* 171.

² Keith's *Scottish Bishops*, 515.

obedience without the limits of his proper diocese. To place, therefore, American episcopacy upon a footing commensurate with the wants of the whole community, a convention, composed of deputies both clerical and lay, assembled in Philadelphia on the 25th of September, 1785. It was deputed from the seven states of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina. At this, articles of union were framed, and various alterations in the liturgy were proposed; partly such as were needed by the government of the country, partly such as were not undesirable, and partly such as were decidedly so. An address was also drawn up to the English prelacy, acknowledging past favours received through the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and requesting consecration for such individuals elected to the episcopate, as should be sent over for that purpose. To this address an answer was returned, signed by the two archbishops and eighteen bishops, expressing a desire to comply with the request transmitted from America, but requiring time until full information had been given as to the proposed alterations. To some of these, when submitted for consideration, the two archbishops made objections; and they were, therefore, abandoned. When this was done, application was made for the consecration of three bishops, one for New York, another for Pennsylvania, and a third for Virginia. The last, Dr. Griffith, was prevented by narrow circumstances from embarking for England; but the two former, the Doctors Provoost and White, sailed, and were consecrated by Archbishop Moore, assisted by two bishops, in the chapel at Lambeth house, on the 4th of February, 1787, an act of parliament having been obtained to authorise episcopal consecrations for foreign countries. In 1789, an ecclesiastical convention assembled again, and was attended by Bishop Seabury, with the northern clergy. The whole terms of church-union were now permanently arranged, and the liturgy was rendered very much the same that it has continued ever since. The canons also were placed in their existing state: so that 1789 proved a most important year in the American church. In the following year a bishop was consecrated for Virginia, by the archbishop of Canterbury. This was Dr. Madison, the individual originally intended for that see having resigned when prevented from sailing for Europe. The number of bishops consecrated in England, canonically necessary for transmitting the episcopal function, being now complete, three more prelates were consecrated in America. In 1796 a fourth prelate was consecrated there, to fill the see of Connecticut, which had become vacant by the decease of Bishop Seabury. Thus, when the eighteenth century closed, the North American church was in a state of complete organisation and progressive popularity. But it had not hitherto overcome, to any great extent, the mass of sectarian prejudice which the bulk of the settlers brought from Europe, and established as a kind of heir-looms in their families. The episcopal clergy were little more than two hundred, and these were dispersed, commonly far apart, over the eastern states.¹ A wide

¹ Caswall's *America and the American Church*, p. 184, Lond. 1839. Since the first

foundation was, however, deeply laid, and upon this, in the present century, a noble structure has risen rapidly, the happiness of America, the glory both of her and Britain.

§ 30. It is far from satisfactory to know, that religious dissensions furnished a principal opening for effecting the flagitious partition of Poland. The protestants had once formed a numerous and important party in that country, the ground being prepared for their doctrine by a copious infusion of Hussite opinions before Luther arose. But as time advanced, they became a very divided body, many of them adhering to the Saxon confession, but more still embracing the Swiss. Their credit was also, at one time, seriously compromised by the extensive diffusion of Socinianism in Poland.¹ Hence the Romanists had a very plausible colour for treating them not only as men without any fixed religious opinions, but also as afflicted with a fatal leaning towards unquestionable heresy. They could likewise bring their own compact society to bear with ruinous effect upon a body so disunited and discredited. Hence the *Dissidents*, as Polish protestants were termed, became defenceless amidst the mass of their hostile countrymen, who took advantage of this condition to despoil them of political rights. They did not, however, tamely submit, but being powerless at home, their suit was urgently pressed upon the neighbouring courts of Petersburg and Berlin. At both it was a very welcome visitor, but especially at the former. Russia desired few things more than power in Poland, and therefore allowed the Dissidents, though really nothing more than a religious party, far from numerous, in a neighbouring kingdom, to have a regular agent in her capital, with whom the imperial ministers were in constant communication. Vainly did the Romish majority controvert the representations thus laid before the Russian government. Catharine, who then occupied with uncommon ability the throne of the Tzars, insisted upon a full restoration of the Dissidents to all their constitutional privileges. Such was, however, the storm occasioned by their claims at home, that all parties within the country became willing to see a compromise, and a partial restoration of their privileges appeared likely to give Poland repose. The empress no sooner became acquainted with a prospect so little in unison with her interest, than she stimulated the Polish protestants to rest satisfied with nothing short of unqualified concession, promising to aid them, if necessary, by an army forty thousand strong. The Romish party, aware of the support which its opponents were encouraged to expect, granted certain privileges to the latter, in the diet of 1766. But the Dissidents indignantly rejected them, pronouncing their actual depression a more promising condition than half measures of relief. Thus Poland,

edition of this work was published, an interesting and valuable volume has appeared from the pen of the Rev. Samuel Wilberforce, now bishop of Oxford, entitled, *A History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America*. Use has been made of this, and of another able and useful work, *The*

History of the Church of England in the Colonies and Foreign Dependencies of the British Empire, by the Rev. J. S. M. Anderson.

¹ The Socinians were expelled by a decree of the diet in 1658. Krasinski, ii. 396.

which urgently required certain civil reforms to protect her independence, was driven from arrangements to effect them, by the violence of religious dissension. This the courts of Petersburg and Berlin took effectual care to prolong by a treaty bearing a very liberal aspect, concluded in January, 1767, binding the two governments to see a restoration of the Dissidents to all their ancient rights and privileges. An overpowering Russian force extorted this concession from a committee ostensibly authorised by the diet that assembled in October, 1767, and another diet, holden in the following year, confirmed it. But this latter diet was a mere mockery of constitutional forms: it was incomplete in the number of its members, and overawed by Russian bayonets.¹ Hence the Dissidents recovered their privileges at the price of their country's independence, and the Romish majority was plausibly supplied with a new cause for hating them, in their intimate connexion with a dangerous neighbour. That majority found, accordingly, no difficulty in organising confederacies in opposition to privileges granted under such discreditable auspices. Thus Poland was thrown into an intolerable state of anarchy and violence, to the great satisfaction of the neighbouring powers. Those ambitious governments watched its miseries until the year 1772, and then affecting to believe them incapable of domestic cure, while they were seriously prejudicial to their own interests, Russia, Austria, and Prussia moved armies in secret concert upon the distracted country, and partitioned it among themselves.

¹ Krasinski, ii. 530.

A BRIEF SKETCH
OF THE
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
OF THE
EARLIER YEARS
OF THE
NINETEENTH CENTURY.*

§ 1. Re-establishment of religion in France—§ 2. Renewed observance of Sunday—
§ 3. Opposition to the French *Concordat*—§ 4. Papal coronation of Napoleon—§ 5.
Overthrow of the Pope's temporal power—§ 6. Restoration of the Jesuits—§ 7. Papal
arrangements with France on the restoration of the Bourbons—§ 8. Movements for
the removal of Romish disabilities in England—§ 9. Opposition to this removal—
§ 10. Formation of the Catholic Association—§ 11. Repeal of the Corporation and
Test Acts—§ 12. Removal of Romish disabilities—§ 13. Cautionary provisions—§ 14.
Continuance of Irish agitation—§ 15. Colonial episcopacy—§ 16. New academical
institutions—§ 17. American episcopalians—§ 18. Conclusion.

§ 1. HOWEVER desirous the French republicans might be that Rome should not have another pope when Pius VI. expired, the great bulk of those who professed its religion felt very differently. Austria gave effect to their wishes. The emperor procured a meeting of the dispersed cardinals at Venice, then an appendage to his monarchy, and they elected, on the 14th of March, 1800, Barnabas Chiaromonti to fill the papal see. He called himself Pius VII., and within a few weeks of his election he entered his capital as a sovereign prince, the French armies having sustained such reverses in the preceding autumn as left Southern Italy to its ancient masters. The first transaction of superior importance which came before him was a negotiation with the government of France. At the head of it, as first consul, was now Napoleon Buonaparte, one of the ablest men that the human family has ever produced. The master-mind of that seemingly fortunate soldier soon saw clearly that the revolutionary experiment of governing a country without religion had proved a wretched failure. He was not, indeed, so happy as really to have any religious impressions of his own. While in Egypt he had even sought popular support by

pretending to a belief in Mahometanism. He was become, however, anxious that France should again profess Romanism, feeling morally certain that some religion was indispensable for the people, and that they were quite unprepared for any other. He opened, accordingly, soon after the papal court was established again, a friendly communication with it, and his overtures were received in a cordial and flattering manner. There was, in fact, no reason to despair of the Romish cause in France, and hence the papacy was eagerly upon the watch for some favourable incident. A considerable degree of religion still remained in the rural districts, notwithstanding the scoffing spirit of infidelity rampant in Paris, and other great towns. A few clergymen kept many of the churches open, and even maintained a stealthy correspondence with their exiled bishops. It was this latter circumstance that Napoleon especially urged upon his council, as an argument for establishing religion anew. These revolutionary statesmen started at the idea of encouraging Christianity on its own account, but their instinct as politicians could not overlook the expediency of preventing it from supplying a channel of communication with hostile foreigners. ‘At present,’ said Napoleon to them, ‘fifty bishops in the pay of England direct the French clergy: we must immediately destroy their influence. That number of prelates must be appointed by the first consul, and inducted by the pope. Their salaries must be paid by the people, and by them the parish priests must be appointed, with stipends from the same source. All must take the oath, or be driven out of the country. On such terms, the pope will confirm the sale of the national domains, and consecrate the revolution.’¹ Having thus gained a reluctant acquiescence in his views, Napoleon laid his plans for the reorganisation of a national church before the court of Rome. They were not such as to meet with ready approval there, and accordingly the negotiation proved very tedious. At length, on the 15th of July, 1801, the *Concordat*, as it was called, was regularly concluded, although not finally ratified at Rome until the 9th of August,² nor legally received in France until the 8th of April, 1802. It declared Romanism the national religion, and established a hierarchy of ten archbishops and fifty bishops. The former were to have salaries of 600*l.* a year, the latter of 400*l.*; both were to be nominated by the first consul. Parish priests were also to be provided with assistants, where necessary; their salaries in the larger parishes were to be 60*l.* a year, in the smaller 48*l.* They were to be nominated by the bishops, subject to the first consul’s approbation. Houses and gardens were to be provided both for the bishops and clergy, by the departments in which they were situated, and by them too ruinous churches were to be repaired. It was also provided, that no writing whatever from the court of Rome should be published or carried into execution in France, without authority from its government; that no agent of the Roman see, without the same authority, should enter upon any business relating to the Gallican church, either in the French terri-

¹ Alison, iv. 671.

² Collins, 215.

tory or elsewhere; that no decrees of foreign convocations, even if they should be general councils, should be published in France, until its government should have ascertained whether they were agreeable to its institutions, and unlikely to disturb the public tranquillity; that no ecclesiastical deliberative assembly of any kind should be holden in France without express permission from the government; and that an appeal should lie to the council of state in every case of alleged abuse or misgovernment in the superior ecclesiastical authorities. By these restrictions, France was really rendered not less independent of Rome than protestant states are. Nor does any such state desire a more effective control over its Romish subjects than was thus given to the French government. Nor could any charge of needless profusion be brought against the scale upon which religion was to be supported. Its claims, on the contrary, had evidently been met in a spirit of sordid parsimony. Yet notwithstanding, the influential classes in France generally disapproved of the *Concordat*. They viewed it as the first step towards undoing all that had been accomplished in the revolution, and when their protracted opposition proved unavailing at last, they persisted in a display of dissatisfaction. This irreligious feeling was powerfully supported by the infidel population of Paris, which loudly reprobated the reimposition of restraints so completely and contumeliously shaken off. Buonaparte, however, was proof against a clamour which he knew to be raised on grounds untenable, and therefore evanescent. In spite of refusals from some of the most illustrious generals to attend him, he went in imposing state to *Notre Dame*, on the 11th of April, 1802, to assist at a grand high mass, in which the Romish ritual put forth all its pageantry to celebrate the national restoration of religion. For the first time republican prejudices were shocked by seeing the first consul's servants in livery: the foreign ambassadors received notice that their own attendants would be expected to appear in the same aristocratic dress; and even the public functionaries of France were invited to make an unusual display. Few of these officials, however, were prepared for such a call, and their equipages, accordingly, rather detracted from the show; but its brilliance was sustained by an unusual degree of military parade; and thus the goddess of Reason's late temple was formally rescued from the blasphemous absurdities of her pretended worship with a splendour that must have driven Paris into some thought of better things.¹

§ 2. Sunday was now again observed, to a considerable extent, throughout France. The *Concordat* stipulated that the government offices should be closed on that day. This was done immediately. A consular decree then directed all marriages to be proclaimed on that day. At the Tuileries mass was celebrated daily, and on Sundays it was attended, after a fashion, by the first consul. He spent the ten minutes, or thereabouts, which it occupied, in an adjoining apartment with the doors open, but did not intermit the examination of papers

¹ Alison, iv. 677.

or other business that could be transacted with little or no noise. Attempts were made by some of the clergy to carry him beyond such a half-ceremonious visit to the house of God. But they were unavailing. He treated his religious profession as a mere political duty, which he was bound to discharge just so far as his public position required, and no further. Indeed, he could not make a greater show of piety, without lowering his character by a tinge of hypocrisy. In the country, this restoration of religion, such as it was, gave in most cases great satisfaction. The labouring poor, indeed, were generally benefited by it, even upon grounds merely secular. The holiday that closed every decade had not only defrauded honest industry of one resting-day in every month; it had also given birth to arrangements which took from the labourer all regular seasons of rest. The selfish pretenders to philosophy who had branded the observance of Sunday as an insane superstition, were commonly found impatient of everything that lessened their command over the labour of others. Foreign governments too hailed with sincere pleasure this recovery of France from the most offensive and hopeless, though not the most ferocious, of her revolutionary paroxysms.¹ Make her Christian again, and, instead of the pest and infamy of Europe,—from whose contact nothing was reasonably to be expected but poison and perfidy,—she might invite friendly relations with her neighbours, by her high tone of civilisation, and a nice perception of national integrity. Thus Napoleon's political sagacity was never more clearly shown than by the firm stand that he made for the re-establishment of religion.

§ 3. As one of the objects contemplated by the *Concordat* was the regular formation of a new French hierarchy, the pope wrote a letter to the surviving prelates of that country, recommending them to resign their several sees. He cited the example of three hundred African bishops, who expressed a noble willingness to give up their episcopal chairs with a view to the termination of the Donatistic schism. He likewise entreated them to remember, that the same self-devotion had been exhibited by St. Austin and Gregory Nazianzen. By these persuasions, however, only the bishops who had bound themselves to the revolution were led into the desired resignations. Those who had all along stood out would not abandon their position. They were in number thirty-six, and they signed a strong protest against this papal call upon them. The archbishop of Narbonne, with twelve of his brethren then resident in England, justified by a letter to Pius their refusal to comply with his request. Nor did the *Concordat* itself fare better in these quarters. The exiled prelacy of France was generally opposed to it, and those of the body that had found refuge in England lost no opportunity of communicating this disapprobation to their own countrymen. English vessels contrived means of holding occasional communications with the coast of France, and thus the objections of the exiled French prelates to Napoleon's new ecclesias-

¹ Alison, iv. 681.

tical arrangements found their way into all parts of his country. Great complaints were made of this in Paris, and endeavours were not wanting to procure the banishment from England of the prelates who thus kept up religious irritation in France, especially of the bishops of Arras and St. Pol de Leon, whose activity was the greatest in maintaining a correspondence with their own country, adverse to its recent settlement of ecclesiastical questions. The English government was, however, honourably conspicuous for maintaining the rights of hospitality during the whole course of the revolutionary wars, and it was most unlikely to violate them for the termination of dissatisfaction, which might importantly serve itself.¹

§ 4. But however Pius might be grieved and even embarrassed by the refusals which reached him from the most respectable portion of the French prelacy, he felt too much interest in the complete restoration of his creed in their country, and perhaps also too much apprehension of its powerful ruler, to decline any important call from Paris. One was made in the summer of 1804, which put his flexibility to a severe trial. In the May of that year Buonaparte had been nominated, with a most remarkable degree of national unanimity, emperor of the French, and he desired to have this new dignity solemnly confirmed to him by a grand coronation at the pope's hands. It was true that nothing had seemed more likely to shake his power than the *Concordat*, from the violent opposition that it raised. His power, notwithstanding, had been rapidly on the increase ever since this arrangement had been effected; and he knew that fresh sanctions from religion, however scoffers might receive them after their inveterate fashion, would have no inconsiderable weight with the great majority. He might even be fortified in this opinion by the papal coronation of Pippin, which gave a sort of consecration to the Carolingian dynasty, and excluded the former race by authority of the church. Early in June, accordingly, Pius received a request to officiate at the new emperor's coronation. Considerable difficulties were immediately raised by the cardinals, partly, perhaps, with a view to some further concessions to the church, but partly, there can be no doubt, from the honest prejudices of the individuals themselves, and a strong perception of the solid objections that opposed compliance. The time might be gone by for urging that none but the German emperors, the presumed successors of the Roman Cæsars, were justified by their admitted position to demand coronation from the bishop of the ancient capital of Europe; a prelate, too, whose own position had so wonderfully advanced in the lapse of ages. But there were incontrovertible reasons for declining to gratify the recently created monarch. He was denounced, by the largest portion of Europe, as nothing better than a mere adventurer, who had gained by impudence and good luck possession of a revolutionary throne which would soon reject him in favour of its rightful owner. A coronation by the pope was really, therefore, the pontifical recognition of a new dynasty as the successor

¹ Collins, 218.

of the Bourbons, whose family had been acknowledged for centuries, by the Roman see, as legitimate occupants of the French throne, and whose representative, an obedient son of the papal church, was then the claimant of that throne. But neither Pius nor the cardinals could do any more than demur and negotiate. Buonaparte was an urgent suitor, whom it might be ruin to deny. He was, accordingly, apprised by a letter from Rome, early in the autumn, that the pope would officiate as desired, and would set out for France within a very short time. Pius arrived at Fontainebleau on the 25th of November, in his own carriage, with the emperor by his side. Napoleon had gone out on horseback to meet him, and when he did so, immediately alighted. The pontiff did the same, and the two then took their seats in the carriage, Napoleon entering first. From Fontainebleau, Pius proceeded alone to Paris, where he was magnificently lodged in the Tuileries, and received upon every public appearance with extraordinary respect. He confirmed his title to such treatment by a mild dignity at all times, and a Christian-like forbearance upon the few occasions that required it. On the 2nd of December, 1804, he was called upon for the performance of his promise; and he must have found the call very painful, in spite of the various preliminaries that had distracted attention, and any suspicions of his own, that a step so outrageous to the advocates of hereditary monarchy might more than counterbalance those benefits that it must confer upon the church. The ceremony took place at *Notre Dame*, amid a display of the most gorgeous magnificence. But notwithstanding a very favourable winter day, for it was beautifully bright, although severely cold, the democratic populace displayed none of the enthusiasm that had greeted far inferior shows of a revolutionary kind. After all, Pius was not allowed to crown the emperor. He merely anointed and gave him the benediction, and having done so, Napoleon took the crown and placed it on his head with his own hands. The empress then knelt before him, and he crowned her with all that grace of manner that rarely fails superior minds on great occasions, when fully conscious of undisputed pre-eminence. The presence of Pius upon this most remarkable day, excited comments little favourable to him throughout Europe, nearly all men treating it as a proof of time-serving timidity, or sycophancy; and the monarchical party considering it besides as a breach of integrity, and immeasurably below the papal dignity. The pontiff had, however, a most embarrassing choice to make. He knew the gross irreligion that stalked through all the influential classes in France; he knew, probably, equally well, that Napoleon's religion was really very much upon a par with that of those around him, and that his temper defied contradiction. Had a refusal, therefore, come from Rome, to assist at the imperial coronation, not only present advantages might have been lost to the church, and future hopes foreclosed, but even the very existence of the papacy might have been abruptly terminated. Thus the pope's journey to Paris, though deeply humiliating to him personally, in spite of the gay gilding scattered so profusely upon it, and embarrassing besides to all under papal pre-

judices out of France, might fairly be considered, in a choice of evils, as the less.

§ 5. Pius, however, had among his objects in view, in gratifying Napoleon, some of a character merely temporal, and his very flattering reception at the French court inspired him with hopes of succeeding in them. As a sovereign prince, he could never cease to regret that three legations in Romagna, ceded by the treaty of Tolentino, remained in the power of France. Nor did he despair, from the sacrifices that he had made, and the cordial manner in which they were received at Paris, of recovering from imperial generosity at least this portion of the papal territories. Some of his more discerning statesmen entertained no such opinion. They remarked, in all the professions and civilities by which he had recently been greeted, a studious abstinence from everything that bore upon mere politics. The French court was most anxious to treat the pope with profound respect, and to meet his wishes upon spiritual affairs: upon temporal it seemed unwilling to enter. Pius was not, however, convinced by this ominous silence, that his eagerness to rule where former popes had ruled must prove unavailing. Shortly after his return to Rome, he despatched, accordingly, a memorial to Paris, particularising the losses undergone by the papal see, and admonishing the emperor to emulate the glory of Charles the Great, and restore the severed territories. He received a very civil answer, expressing earnest wishes for the extension of his religious authority, and even intimating a desire to confer temporal advantages upon him, if any opportunity of doing so should arise; but treating actual arrangements as irrevocable, and any diminution of the kingdom of Italy as wholly out of the question. In October, 1805, he felt still more forcibly the hopelessness of occupying any higher position than that of the most dignified of Napoleon's vassals, and the most effective of his tools. The Austrian war made Ancona, the most important fortress in the papal states, of great value to France, and her troops took possession of it without any hesitation. Vainly did Pius remonstrate. He was coolly told in reply, that although sovereign of Rome, Napoleon was its emperor. This announcement of an intention to treat him as a mere viceroy, the pope met with great propriety, denying that Rome owed even temporal obedience to any earthly power but his own, and utterly refusing to make any declaration of war against nations embroiled with France, whether Romish or protestant. Such language proved highly offensive at Paris, and French troops successively occupied the whole papal territory, holding even Rome itself in a sort of siege. Pius now talked of retiring to the castle of St. Angelo, and of waiting there with gates strongly barred, but with no other preparation for resistance, until French cannon should force an entrance. He was, notwithstanding, pressed with fresh demands, amounting to a complete surrender of his rights as a sovereign prince; and remaining steadfast in his refusal, Rome was occupied, on the 2nd of February, 1808, by a large body of French troops. Within a few days afterwards, the papal court was officially informed that this occupation would continue

until his holiness joined the emperor in a league offensive and defensive. Such junction being refused, the government of Rome was regularly assumed by France on the 2nd of April, and the pope was confined as a prisoner in the Quirinal palace. He still remained wholly unsubdued, exhibiting a picture of virtuous resignation that will do him immortal honour. Napoleon's great successes, however, were proof against any warning from this resistance. On the 17th of May, 1809, he issued a decree formally annexing Rome to the French empire, and declaring it a free city. This conclusive aggression extorted from the pope a bull of excommunication against Napoleon, and all concerned in his own dethronement, but carefully restricting his thunder to spirituals; an improvement upon such bulls as issued by former popes, and pretending to depose obnoxious princes, that shows a wiser and a better spirit in modern times.¹ Still there was enough in this fulmination to awake uneasiness. It evidently had some weight upon the public mind in Rome, and might create embarrassments elsewhere. Hence Miollis, the French commander in that city, seeing any recall of the bull utterly hopeless, became anxious for the pope's removal. In concert, accordingly, with Murat, at Naples, he gave the necessary orders to general Radet, on the 4th of July, 1809. A strong battalion arriving the next day from Naples, the Quirinal was surrounded at ten on that very night, by three regiments. Thirty men silently scaled the garden walls, and posted themselves under the palace windows; fifty more entered the house itself through the window of an uninhabited room, and the gates being thrown open, Radet entered at the head of his troops. These various movements, however, consumed the night, and it was not until six o'clock in the following morning that the pope, awakened by strokes of hatchets forcing the interior doors, became sensible of his situation. He prepared for instant death. Calling for the ring, a present from queen Clotilda, worn by his predecessor when dying, he turned his eyes upon it with a mild serenity of expression, and ordered the doors to be thrown open, to prevent further violence. Radet immediately entered, and found him surrounded by a few prelates, all evidently prepared for the worst, and certain to meet it like Christians. By such a spectacle, the revolutionary soldier was almost unnerved. With countenance and voice betraying deep emotion, he told the aged pontiff, that his own painful duty was to require of him the renunciation of all his sovereign rights, or, in case of refusal, to conduct him to general Miollis, who would give directions for his ultimate destination. With the utmost calmness, Pius firmly refused to make the desired renunciation, and after a few hasty preparations, he was placed in a carriage, by the side of his able minister, cardinal Pacca, and escorted out of Rome by a powerful body of French cavalry. At Florence, the two were separated, and Pacca was sent to Grenoble by another way. From that place, an especial order of Napoleon's transferred him to the state prison of Fenestrelles in Savoy.

¹ Coote, 321.

There he was kept a close prisoner until the beginning of 1813, when the unparalleled disasters of the Moscow campaign drove Buonaparte upon the forlorn hope of conciliating the pontiff, and his illustrious friend Pacca was allowed to join him at Fontainebleau, with a view to forward the imperial designs. To that place Pius himself had been recently removed, and he was detained there until Napoleon's overthrow in 1814. He had previously spent three years at Savona, whither he was transferred from Grenoble, and the cause of his removal from that place was intelligence that an English frigate was cruising in the Gulf of Lyons, with a view to his escape. At Savona he was not actually in prison, but always under strict observation. To the seizure of his person, Buonaparte protested at St. Helena that he was not privy; and such, probably, is the literal truth. But his whole subsequent conduct proves incontrovertibly that he approved of the act after it was committed, and hence there can be no doubt that it was in strict conformity with his own instructions, although his agents might have been intentionally allowed considerable discretion in the execution of them. The captivity of Pius required, in fact, no slight caution, and hence it was obviously convenient to shift the responsibility of it, as much as possible. In spite of the scoffing spirit upon all serious subjects fatally prevalent, even in France, a pope who was a prisoner strongly moved popular pity and veneration. When Pius was first taken to Grenoble, the French people crowded around him with the warmest demonstrations of respectful affection. On the Italian side of the Alps, he was more than once under the necessity of exerting his personal influence to prevent attempts at a rescue.¹

§ 6. The earliest measure of much general importance, which followed the return of Pius to Rome, was the revival of the Jesuits, or more properly, their reorganisation as a religious order, capable of indefinite extension. As masses of individuals, more or less connected together, they had never been extinct; and in two recent instances, they had already been formed into national communities. The emperor Paul obtained papal authority for their revival in Russia, in 1801, and in 1804 they were revived in Sicily, at the suit of king Ferdinand; a patronage but moderately flattering in either case.² These concessions the pope, by a bull issued in August 1814, extended to his own states, and to all others. He authorised, accordingly, Thaddeus Borrozowski, general of the order, to reunite its members into one community, for the purpose of employing themselves in education, and in clerical duties.³ The publication of this bull was followed by an act, ordaining the restitution of the funds which formed a patrimony for the Jesuits, and compensation for such of their property as had been confiscated.⁴ The reason assigned for a measure so decisive as the restoration of an order which had been generally obnoxious, in Romish countries even, but a few years before,

¹ Alison, vii. 615.

² *Hist. of the Jesuits*, i. 10.

³ Butler's *Hist. Mem.* iv. 355.

⁴ *Hist. of the Jesuits*, i. 11.

was solicitations from persons of every class,¹ and the obvious duty of employing a body so 'vigorous and experienced to row the bark of St. Peter, tossed by continual storms.'² This metaphorical language has been interpreted as meant for protestantism;³ which unquestionably was the original mark that Jesuits aimed at. The papal party, however, interprets it as meant for infidelity.⁴ Nor is this view unreasonable. England, a protestant state, had been mainly instrumental in the pope's restoration, and of dangers from her creed Pius had long possessed very little leisure to think. But he had seen a great deal of the dangers caused by infidelity. He therefore naturally thought most of the evils from that quarter, and reasoned that they were more likely to be diminished by the combined efforts of a compact body admirably organised and skilfully directed, like the Jesuitic order, than by the desultory movements of individuals led by their own impulses to come forward, and commonly possessing neither the discretion nor the ability to come forward effectively. But it is plain that Jesuitism, made once more thoroughly effective, will ever seek its principal objects of attack among adherents of a scriptural faith. Such religionists are likely to take a full share in the warfare against infidelity; but their influence, and even their existence, always menace with absolute extinction such articles of faith as have no surer warrant than tradition, and such religious usages as are palpably akin to downright heathenism. The inherent rottenness of the system that labours under these objections, appears from few things more clearly than from an instinctive clinging to organised combinations during many ages, and, as society advanced, from its urgent need of a combination so versatile and so perfectly organised as that of the Jesuits. In this proteiform body, individuals are merged in the whole. Their personal sense of moral responsibility even is liable to be seriously impaired by the share of it seemingly thrown upon a superior; and the superior himself is exposed to a similar evil from confidential communications with select counsellors, and from his dependence upon the recorded principles of his order. In the end, undoubtedly, such a society can hardly fail of injuring the cause that it may temporarily serve. When success has aroused a grasping ambition in itself, and a jealous hostility in others, all its proceedings are likely to be regarded with a suspicion greater even than the necessity requires, and the exertions of individual members are very liable to be undervalued. The men are known to be tools artfully used by

¹ Butler's *Hist. Mem.* iv. 355.

² *Hist. of the Jesuits*, i. 10.

³ 'The order of the Jesuits,' says Villers, 'the most important of all the orders, was placed in opposition to the Reformation, and it acquired a preponderance proportioned to the enormous mass which it was intended to counterbalance. It is with reference to the same great object of opposing the Reformation, that the present pope' (1816) 'has declared that he should deem himself guilty of a great crime towards

God, if, amidst the dangers of the Christian republic, in other words, of the cause of popery, he should neglect to employ the aids which the special Providence of God had put in his power.' *History of the Jesuits*, ii. 396.

⁴ 'It is in vain that the advocates of his holiness will contend that he desired the aid of the Jesuits against infidelity; for where is the danger to be apprehended from infidelity now?' *Ibid.*

others, and the purposes to which they are applied may be thought such as the parties themselves, if honestly under their own guidance, would not have more than half approved.¹

§ 7. Among the results of the restoration of papal authority was a settlement of ecclesiastical arrangements in France. Pius had been allowed little more power in that country, under the imperial government, than the privilege of granting institution to prelates nominated by Napoleon. This sanction, however, he was found in many cases unwilling to give. In 1811, no fewer than twenty-seven bishops were ineffectual suitors for it. Indignant at such a disregard of his choice, Buonaparte declared the *Concordat* at an end, and called a council of French and Italian prelates to Paris, to provide a remedy for existing evils.² But they came to no determination, during their first session in June. At a second, in the following August, they determined, that unless the pope should institute within six months of the imperial nomination, *that* power should devolve upon the metropolitan. After many conferences, the pope confirmed this decree; but, for some unknown reason, the emperor would not receive it. In 1813, Pius was again plied with negotiations for a new *Concordat*, and Napoleon actually signed certain articles as the basis of one. The pope, however, though a prisoner at Fontainebleau, annulled this plan, and declined all further intercourse with the imperial court, until he should be restored to liberty. Buonaparte's other affairs now became so urgent that he had no leisure to think much of the church, and accordingly, Lewis XVIII., on his restoration, found ecclesiastical questions in a very unsatisfactory state. It was not until after various negotiations, protracted into 1817, that they were placed upon a permanent footing. It was then agreed that the *Concordat* of 1801 should wholly cease, and that the religious concerns of France should stand hereafter upon the basis that had been settled between Leo X. and Francis I. At the same time were founded seven new archbishoprics and twenty-five bishoprics, to be endowed, as before, with stipends out of the public revenue; a wretched substitute for the ease and independence which France, in earlier times, had conferred upon her clergy.³

§ 8. When the nineteenth century opened, the Romanists of Britain and Ireland entertained sanguine expectations, from former concessions, the progress of liberality, and rumours of the minister's favourable intentions, of a complete release from their civil disabilities. It was even believed that Mr. Pitt had given positive encouragement

¹ 'His holiness, since the publication of this bull for the restoration of the society, has twice formally signified, that *it was not his intention that it should have the effect of restoring it to any state which should not recall it, or express a wish for its return.*' (Butler's *Hist. Mem.* iv. 350.) How, then, come fraternities of Jesuits into Britain and Ireland? Surely the state has not 'recalled the order, or expressed any wish for its return.'

² Coote, 320.

³ Collins, 223. [Under the old régime the French church had 23 archbishops and 133 bishops. It has now (1862) 17 archbishops and 67 bishops, besides one in Algeria and three in the colonies. In 1847 the ordinary stipend of a parish priest in the country was from the state 32*l.* a year; in larger populations this is raised to 48*l.*, in the largest to 60*l.* *Ed.*]

to such anticipations, when intent upon the legislative union of the two islands. The real encouragement, however, given by him amounted to no more than an observation in the speech by which he brought the articles of union before the House of Commons, that until that measure should be carried, 'full concessions could not be made to the Romanists, without endangering the state, and shaking the constitution to the centre.'¹ This language, which is at furthest ambiguous, and might be little else than a rhetorical amplification, was naturally taken by the parties anxious for relief as an explicit declaration in their favour. They talked, accordingly, of a promise made; but Mr. Fox candidly expressed a belief, in 1805, that such was not the fact;² and in 1810, Robert Stewart, viscount Castlereagh, (afterwards marquess of Londonderry,) negatived in the House of Commons current reports of a pledge given, in the fullest and most unequivocal manner. That able statesman was the principal conductor of the union in Ireland; and during the two years that it was in agitation he carefully abstained from compromising Mr. Pitt in any manner, as to the political disabilities of Romanists; a silence which near observers, intent upon the removal of them, interpreted unfavourably, and, in consequence, much of their influence was exerted to preserve the Irish legislature. Leading Romanists, accordingly, were surprised to see Mr. Pitt and his friends assigning the impossibility of obtaining royal consent to the removal of Romish disabilities, as a reason for breaking up the ministry, in 1801.³ It is, indeed, probable that this was not the true reason; that rather lying in the difficulties of making peace, experienced by a cabinet which had long bound up its interests with war. Had the assigned cause been the real one, Mr. Pitt could hardly have abstained from advocating the question, when unfettered by office. He did, however, so abstain, and when again in office, that abstinence continued; probably from respect for George III.'s conscientious scruples. But Romish disabilities could not be connected, however inaccurately, with the retirement of a cabinet, popular above most recorded in English history, without giving to the question of their removal an importance in the public mind, that had been hopeless during a long interval of time. Nevertheless, petitions from the Irish Romanists, presented to Parliament in 1805, though leading to animated discussions, were defeated by considerable majorities.⁴ Their principal advocates were the Whigs, then in opposition; and that party coming into power on Mr. Pitt's death, in the beginning of 1806, thought itself bound in honour to use its improved position for the furtherance of that great concession to Romanism which it had strenuously though ineffectually supported under less favourable circumstances. There were, however, strong prejudices against concession, both in the king, and in a majority of the people. The Whig ministry, therefore, only proposed a partial measure of relief. As the law

¹ Bp. Phillpotts's *Letter on the Coronation Oath*. Lond. 1828, p. 136.

² *Ibid.* 138.

³ *Ibid.* 141.

⁴ Bisset's *George III.* vi. 98.

stood in Britain, no Romanist could be even a subaltern in the army; all officers being liable to the operation of the Test Act. In Ireland, by an Act passed in 1793, papists might hold any situation in the army, except that of commander-in-chief, master-general of the ordnance, or general on the staff. On the 5th of March, 1807, Charles, viscount Howick, afterwards the second Earl Grey, moved a bill in the House of Commons, to enable persons of every religious persuasion to hold commissions in the army and navy, without any other condition than the taking of a specified oath of allegiance, repugnant to no religious opinion. When the draught of this bill was submitted to the king, as is usual in matters of importance, he made several objections, but at length his opposition was overcome, and leave was obtained to propose the measure. He was not, however, fully aware of its operation, until this came out in the debate.¹ He then saw, that the measure would remove Romish disabilities to a greater extent than he had calculated, and being apprehensive that his coronation oath was inconsistent with so large a measure of concession, he refused any longer to countenance the bill. Finding him immovable, the ministry determined upon relinquishing their plan; but permission was requested for the lords Grenville and Howick, both to detail in parliament their opinions upon the general policy of such a measure, and to submit the matter again, when circumstances should invite, to the royal consideration. The latter stipulation proved so disagreeable to the king, that, instead of accepting it, he required from the applicants a written pledge, to abstain hereafter from bringing forward any such concession to Roman Catholics as that which he had recently declined. He was told in reply, that no such pledge could be given constitutionally, or consistently with that oath which is taken by every privy councillor. This answer occasioned an abrupt dismissal of the ministry.² The discarded statesmen then lost no time in organising an opposition, which placed concession to the Romanists in the fore-ground of its party warfare.

§ 9. The Whig party, however, which thus patronised the very sect that it had formerly laboured so strenuously to crush, was far from popular. Hence repeated motions made in parliament for *Catholic Emancipation*, as the phrase ran, were negatived by considerable, but decreasing majorities. At length, Mr. Canning, habitually the advocate of Tory politics, came over to the other side, on this much-agitated question. With all that splendid eloquence which was at his command, he moved, on the 22nd of June, 1812, that the house should pledge itself to take into serious consideration, early in the next session of parliament, the Roman Catholic disabilities, with a view to such a final conciliatory disposal of them as might conduce to the national peace and strength, the stability of the protestant establishment, and the general satisfaction of all classes. This motion was carried by a decisive majority of 235 against 106.

¹ Alison, vi. 183.

² Butler, ii. 211.

In the Lords a similar motion was defeated only by a single vote : but such was the turn now taken by public opinion, that many people thought no disappointment whatever likely to have met the Romanists in the upper house, had not a recent meeting in Dublin claimed relief as a matter of right, and menaced opposition with exemplary vengeance.¹ The session of 1813, accordingly, was opened with appearances very much in favour of the Romanists, and their cause went victoriously through some very hard parliamentary fighting ; but when it seemed on the point of complete success in the House of Commons, Charles Abbot, the speaker, afterwards lord Colchester, moved, that, among the concessions, a seat in either house of parliament should not be included. This motion was carried by a majority of four, and the advocates of the measure immediately threw it up in disgust, declaring that such relief as did not include admission to the legislature was unworthy of Romish acceptance.² In subsequent years the question of relief was repeatedly brought forward, but without success. The obstacles to it in the throne were by no means removed, although a deep feeling of religion had been very far from so conspicuous there as in former years, under George III. Towards the close of autumn, in 1810, that exemplary sovereign sank into an insanity from which he never recovered. His eldest son, George, Prince of Wales, who was appointed regent in the following February, acted as if bound by a nice sense of honour to use that delegated authority for the furtherance of such objects as his venerable parent would approve, in case of restoration to reason. He proved also himself, on succeeding to the crown in 1820, averse from the admission of Romanists to political power. His next brother likewise, Frederick, Duke of York, whose manly bearing upon all occasions, and exemplary diligence as commander-in-chief, rendered him popular in spite of some immoral follies at one time, was entirely against further concession to the Romanists. That prince's anxiety upon this subject reached even to the approach of death, and he wished his brother to be apprised of it, if painfully pressed to give way. Most of the Tory party too, a great majority of the people, and nearly all the clergy, remained of opinion, notwithstanding the arguments and importunities perseveringly urged by the Whigs and Romanists, that adherents to the papacy could not safely be trusted with political power, in a state essentially protestant. But so incessant was the clamour for relief, that all men became weary of resistance, and heard impatiently of every fresh exertion to stir the catholic question.

§ 10. As the elective franchise, however, had been conceded to Romanists, in Ireland, in 1793, although it continued closed against them in England, they would not allow themselves to want strenuous advocates in the House of Commons. The Irish priesthood of their church, emerging from the extreme depression under which it had long been kept, had now taken a prominent part in politics. On the

¹ Bisset, vi. 341.

² Butler, ii. 267.

other hand, the influence of Irish protestantism had materially declined within the last few years. The Union, by contracting the number of government situations, was the cause of removal to many protestant families: the low prices of agricultural produce which followed upon the peace of 1814, were another such cause, and the operation of this was very wide. The well-conditioned yeoman could not endure the alteration in his circumstances which thus came upon him. He put up to sale such of his property as was convertible into money, and emigrated to America. In his place came a Romish neighbour, who had been habituated to a far lower degree of artificial comfort.¹ Thus the papal priesthood was acquiring every day a more extensive field. The extraordinary power, however, obtained by Irish Romanism, was chiefly attributable to the *Catholic Association*, an organised confederacy, which soon wielded the populace at its will. This formidable body levied contributions, called catholic rent, on the whole Romish community, a considerable portion of them coming, in very small sums, from the peasantry, although perhaps the poorest in Europe. The alleged purpose of this collection was the promotion of catholic emancipation by every means accessible to money. The magnitude of the instrument thus provided may be estimated from the fact, that in the single month of November, 1824, the sum collected was 3,007*l.* 10*s.* 4*d.* Of the contributors, very many were far from volunteers; but denunciations of the priests from their altars, and intimidating importunities of active neighbours, allowed no Romanist any choice. The result of such a powerful engine was the rapid spread of a violent agitation all over Ireland. Until 1823, the great body of Irish Romanists had thought little about political disabilities, but when the Catholic Association had once thoroughly taken possession of the country, the whole Romish population became wild upon every mention of emancipation, and it was the word that oftenest met the ear. Yet a great degree of misapprehension commonly prevailed as to the object in view. Some of the people supposed it to be the restoration of the forfeited estates; others, the legal establishment of the Romish religion. At length the association assumed so completely the tone of a menacing independent legislature, levying money at its will for purposes of its own, that in 1825 an act of parliament was passed for suppressing it. Ostensibly this act was obeyed, but a new association was immediately formed, in such a manner as to evade the law. During the parliamentary sessions of this and the preceding years, numerous witnesses from Ireland had been examined before committees of the two houses, with a view of throwing some light upon the violent agitation that convulsed that country. Most of these drew flattering pictures of the profound satisfaction, and consequent tranquillity to be expected from emancipation;² although they generally were so cautious as to

¹ Evidence of Daniel O'Connell, Esq. before the House of Commons, March 1, 1825. *Evidence on the State of Ireland.* Lond. 1825, p. 170.

² 'No Catholic clergyman has the slightest disposition to derange that establishment' (the protestant)?—'Not the slightest.' (Evidence of the Rev. M. Collins, June 9,

deny that this concession alone would still the strife of which Britain had become so weary. These light reservations were, however, little noticed by the customary advocates of emancipation. They constantly spoke of that measure as a complete remedy for all the ills of Ireland, and such a view of it daily gained ground.

§ 11. In 1828, catholic emancipation was nevertheless again unsuccessful in parliament, but it gained indirectly an important step by the *Repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts*. Numerous petitions were presented against them, and on the 26th of February, Lord John Russell made a motion for their repeal. Practically they had long fallen into desuetude, the annual indemnity act screening protestant dissenters from their operation. It was, however, argued, that laws bearing a character of needless intolerance ought not to be allowed even to slumber in the statute-book, and besides, that enough of their spirit was left untouched by the annual indemnity, to make them still convertible into engines of oppression. That act did not really render a dissenter eligible to corporate offices; it only exempted him from penalties, in case he should not have taken the sacramental test. An action against him for this neglect could still only by accident miscarry, and even if it did, would leave him liable to the costs. It was obviously improper that any such liability should continue, and there was very little disposition to wish it in the public mind. Persons who were as averse as ever from the concessions desired by Romanists, felt no objection to those now sought by dissenters. They considered the Romish doctrines as inextricably mixed up with politics, and therefore intolerable in parties legislating for a protestant state. Dissenting doctrines were viewed as mere modifications of religious opinion, for which no man was responsible to civil society, but only to God and his own soul. Hence the repeal sought occasioned very little opposition in parliament, and very little notice in the country. It was not, however, deemed proper to weaken the ecclesiastical institutions of the nation by this concession. The act stated that 'the protestant episcopal church of England and Ireland, and the doctrine, discipline, and government thereof, and the protestant presbyterian church of Scotland, and the doctrine, discipline, and government thereof, are by the laws of this realm severally established, permanently and inviolably.' Hence it did not leave corporate officers at liberty to use any power that might come from their several situations, injuriously to the religious establishment of the country. They were to make a solemn declaration, that no power arising from their corporate capacities should be turned by them to the detriment of the church establishment.¹

1824. *Evid. on Ireland*, p. 58.) 'If we were freed from the disabilities under which we labour, we have no mind, and no thought, and no will, but that which would lead us to incorporate ourselves fully and essentially with this great kingdom; for it would be our greatest pride to share in the glories and the riches of

England.'—'If the question, commonly called catholic emancipation, were carried, are you of opinion that religious differences would cease to agitate the public mind in Ireland?—I am very confident they would.' Evidence of the Rt. Rev. Dr. Doyle, March 16, 1825. *Ibid.* pp. 383. 393. *

¹ The following is the declaration pre-

§ 12. During the autumn of 1828, rumours were afloat of an intention in the government to concede the Romish claims. The Great Captain, Arthur Wellesley, Duke of Wellington, a man whose straightforward integrity, and deep insight into human nature, were hardly below his unsurpassed strategic superiority, was then first lord of the treasury. He had said in parliament, that he would give the catholic question full consideration. Hitherto he had viewed it under a sense of individual responsibility. He should now view it as responsible for the chief direction of public affairs. Nevertheless, his vote contributed to the majority of forty-five, by which the measure was lost in the House of Lords, in the session of 1828, and his speech deprecated concession. It was, therefore, considered by such as approved of the Romish disabilities, that he was one of the last men to surrender this long-contested question, and that his announcement of an intention to give it a statesmanlike consideration, merely expressed the honest purpose of a comprehensive mind to search carefully for some plan, whereby moderate Romanists might be shamed out of agitation, and protestant apprehensions might be effectively allayed. His principal coadjutor, too, in the ministry, Mr. Peel, afterwards on his father's death Sir Robert Peel, a statesman whose future eminence was clearly foreseen by the best judges when a youth at college, and whose whole subsequent life had been an unbroken course of judicious application, senatorial distinction, and moral propriety, had invariably been an uncompromising opponent of the Romish claims. It was, consequently, supposed in most quarters that unqualified concession was never to be expected from him any more than from his illustrious chief. When, however, parliament was opened by commission on the 5th of February, 1829, the king's speech, delivered by the lord chancellor, after adverting to the Catholic Association and requiring powers for its suppression, went on to say, 'His majesty recommends, that when this essential object shall have been accomplished, you should take into your deliberate consideration the whole state of Ireland, and that you should review the laws which impose civil disabilities on his majesty's Roman catholic subjects. You will consider whether the removal of those disabilities can be effected consistently with the full and perfect security of our establishments in Church and State, with the maintenance of the reformed religion established by law, and of the rights and privileges of the bishops and of the clergy of this realm, and of the churches committed to their charge. These are institutions which must ever be held sacred in this protestant kingdom, and which it is the duty and the determination of his majesty to preserve

scribed by the act: 'I, A. B., do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, upon the true faith of a Christian, that I will never exercise any power, authority, or influence which I may possess by virtue of the office of — to injure or weaken the protestant church as it is by law established in England, or to disturb the said church, or the

bishops and clergy of the said church, in the possession of any rights or privileges to which such church, or the said bishops and clergy, are, or may be, by law entitled.'—*Act for repealing so much of several Acts as imposes the Necessity of receiving the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper as a Qualification for certain Offices and Employments.* 9th May, 1828.

inviolable.' It was late and reluctantly that George IV. gave his consent to this announcement, and even after the measure became law, he showed marked displeasure towards some individuals who followed his own example in giving way. To the people generally, this paragraph in the royal speech occasioned extreme surprise. The great majority disapproved it highly, and petitions against the proposed concession poured into the two houses of parliament in torrents. It must not, however, be supposed, that even such as disliked Whig politics were unanimous in objecting to the ministerial proposition. On the contrary, the superior sections of the middle classes had long been becoming more and more either careless of the question, or willing to give it up for the sake of peace. Hence the House of Commons had latterly been always found ready for a surrender: a disposition of which Mr. Peel very reasonably complained, saying that a people bent upon the continuance of exclusion should be careful to return representatives steady to that object. But notwithstanding that public feeling bore politically with a weight greatly diminished upon the maintenance of Romish disabilities, it really was adverse as a whole to the complete repeal of them. The clergy and others of the more enlightened advocates for their continuance, looked upon Romish anxiety for legislative powers as chiefly created by a desire to seize upon the religious endowments in Ireland, perhaps also to recover the forfeited estates there, or, at all events, by a sectarian antipathy to the protestant establishment. Hence the clamour was thought more likely to be continued by concession than extinguished, its real objects extending far beyond its present demands. Among the more ignorant enemies to concession there was, undoubtedly, a large infusion of mere prejudice. People fancied that Romanists, unless excluded from all hope of power, were likely to gain the ascendancy even in England, and to renew the horrors of Mary's reign. Thus, there was a general feeling against concession, and if popular petitions could have averted it, the year 1829 would have seen it once more refused. Mr. Peel, in recommending the measure, attributed most of the evils afflicting Ireland to an indisposition towards the settlement of this question. Although his own opinions, therefore, upon its abstract merits, continued unchanged, yet he thought a longer denial of concession highly inexpedient. He did not, however, consider it desirable that Romanists should exercise legislative powers without binding themselves by oath to abstain from abusing them for any of their own sectarian purposes. Nor did he mean to make Romanists eligible to the offices of commander-in-chief, or of lord chancellor, or of lord lieutenant of Ireland; or to any situation in the church, or in the institutions connected with it. He wished also to abridge the power so offensively used by the Romish priests of Ireland, in influencing parliamentary elections. He therefore proposed to abolish the forty-shilling franchise in that country, and allow no freeholders to vote with a qualification under ten pounds. By this alteration it was considered, that men under the coercion of priestly menace and artifice, would be generally excluded from the poll. He meant also to restrict

Romanists elected to corporate offices, from taking the ensigns of their dignity to any other place of worship than one connected with the established church. He wished likewise to prevent members of the Romish hierarchy from assuming those titles of ecclesiastical dignity which it had been so much their practice to assume, even with offensive claims of an exclusive right to them;¹ and as objections against Jesuits were extensively entertained, he contemplated their gradual removal, and proposed that all members of that order should at once be under the necessity of registering their names. The duke of Wellington, in recommending concession to the upper house, dwelt chiefly upon the prospect of civil war involved in refusal, and of the miseries which his own experience, above that of most men, enabled him to say, any appeal to arms must bring upon the country. Other speakers considered concession as the only way to annihilate that defiance of constituted authorities which then prevailed in Ireland, and one of the surest protections for her established church. On the other hand, it was contended, that such unqualified concession was quite inconsistent with a government essentially protestant, and most unlikely to tranquillise Ireland, while it would probably seal the ruin of her protestant establishment. Arguments, however, against the proposition, though strenuously and ably urged, from many quarters highly worthy of attention, proved wholly unavailing. In the House of Commons, the measure passed by a majority of 178; in the House of Lords by a majority of 104. It received the royal assent on the

¹ Dr. Doyle pronounced the archbishop of Dublin no more entitled to that see than to the dukedom of Leeds. He himself published pamphlets under the signature of J. K. L., *i. e.* James Kildare and Leighlin, the last two names being those of the united sees which he filled as Romish chief pastor. It is notoriously the usage among Irish Romanists to address their titular archbishops as your Grace, and their titular bishops as my Lord. These titular prelacies were, however, for many years, of foreign and hostile appointment. 'The right of presenting to all sees in Ireland was vested by usage or by law, I do not know which, in the Stuart family, previous to their being expelled from these countries; and whilst a descendant of that family resided at Rome, he was accustomed to recommend to the Irish catholic sees; from the death of the late pretender to the present time, the right of appointment to bishoprics in Ireland has vested solely and exclusively in the pope; but from that period until the present, he has not in any one instance that has come to my knowledge (and I have made very diligent inquiries upon the subject) appointed any person, unless such as had been previously recommended to him by some person or persons in this country. The persons who so recom-

mend generally are the chapter, and where there is no chapter existing, the parochial clergy of the diocese, and the metropolitan, or suffragan bishops of the province where the see happens to be vacant.' (Evidence of the Rt. Rev. Dr. Doyle, March 16, 1825, *ut supra*, 320.) Thus the persons really thought among Romanists entitled to the Irish sees, were long nominated by the pretender, and latterly by certain societies or individuals at home, unknown to the law in any corporate capacity; such persons ultimately founding their pretensions upon the act of an Italian bishop usurping an interference in British affairs, for which he can establish no valid claim whatever, and which is directly contrary to the statutes of the realm. This interference too contradicts a maxim of the canon law, which forbids the appointment of another bishop to a see already provided with one. The Irish sees, however, are so provided by the law of the land. But this law is to be treated as a nullity, and an individual beneficed by it is to be treated as no more entitled to his preferment than he is to any particular English peerage. As public attention had been recently called to these facts, the Catholic Relief Bill could hardly fail of making some provision for them.

13th of April, 1829, and on the 28th of that month, three Romish peers took their seats in the upper house.¹ The bill for disfranchising the Irish forty-shilling freeholders passed without a division in either house, although in the earlier stages, objections to it had been urged both by lords and commoners.

§ 13. The great measure, by which Britain had abandoned her long-cherished principle of excluding Romanists from legislative privileges, treated them as any other class of dissenters, except in such cases as they were decidedly separated from the general body by religious peculiarities bearing directly upon the national institutions. Hence no notice was taken of a *veto* upon appointments to their prelacies, which had been so often keenly contested during the thirty years' discussion upon the catholic question. All such matters of internal regulation were passed over in silence as nothing else than the private concerns of a sect in the empire, with which the state had no right or reason to interfere, so long as they did not act upon its established policy. Upon the principle of providing against such interference, where it might fairly be apprehended, Romanists were required to take a particular oath on entering parliament. This binds them to the Act of Settlement, it being obviously more agreeable to their prejudices, that representatives of the Stuarts, professing their own religion, especially as they stand higher in the scale of descent, should occupy the throne in preference to protestant representatives. It binds them also to the rejection of those anti-social pretensions, by which unquestionably the court of Rome, whatever may be said of the church, has repeatedly compromised its character. It binds them likewise to the existing institutions of the country, and restricts them from any use of their legislative privileges to the injury of the church establishment, or of the protestant religion. They are obviously open to temptation in these respects, from the prevalence of a notion that the church establishment was originally founded for the diffusion of their own opinions, and from a belief that protestants are fatally misled by doctrines no older than Luther.² Still further

¹ There were then eight Romish peers in England, and fourteen baronets. Of Romish gentry, there were above 300 families, generally very ancient, and often very opulent. In Scotland, there were two Romish earls, and in the Highlands, at the beginning of the last century, there were more than 60,000 Roman catholics. But the two rebellions of 1715 and 1746, by breaking up the clan system, made great alterations there, and among them was an extensive diffusion of protestantism, in quarters that had hitherto rejected it. *Gent. Mag.* March, 1829.

² The following is the oath prescribed by the act: 'I, A. B., do sincerely promise and swear, that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to his majesty —, and will defend him to the utmost of my power against all conspiracies and attempts what-

ever which shall be made against his person, crown, or dignity; and I will do my utmost endeavour to disclose and make known to his majesty, his heirs, and successors, all treasons or traitorous conspiracies which may be formed against him or them: and I do faithfully promise to maintain, support, and defend, to the utmost of my power, the succession of the crown, which succession, by an act intituled *An Act for the further Limitation of the Crown, and better securing the Rights and Liberties of the Subject*, is and stands limited to the princess *Sophia*, electress of Hanover, and the heirs of her body, being protestants; hereby utterly renouncing and abjuring any obedience or allegiance unto any other person claiming or pretending a right to the crown of this realm: and I do further declare that it is not an article of my faith, and that I do

to take away from Romanists all temptation to tamper with the church, any of them who should attain high office, are restrained from advising the crown in the exercise of ecclesiastical patronage.¹ The arrogant assumption of titles from prelaties and deaneries conferred upon others by law, is made liable to a fine of one hundred pounds, for every time in which it may be committed.² A restriction is also placed, under a penalty of fifty pounds, upon all displays of the Romish religion, except in places of worship, or private houses:³ which is no more than a judicious protection to ungarded youth and ignorance against the fascination of theatrical rites, and a rational provision against the effects of that popular disgust which might occasionally rise on the needless exhibition of them. Of Jesuits, and all other monastic societies of men,⁴ the act contemplates the gradual abolition within the United Kingdom.⁵ For the accomplishment of this object in an inoffensive manner, all such monastics then resident in the realm were to register themselves within six months,⁶ and all such of alien birth, coming into the realm afterwards, were made liable to banishment for life.⁷ Any such persons, however, born subjects of the British crown, and then abroad, might return and be registered.⁸ Any other such

renounce, reject, and abjure the opinion, that princes excommunicated or deprived by the pope, or any other authority of the see of *Rome*, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or by any person whatsoever; and I do declare, that I do not believe that the pope of *Rome*, or any other foreign prince, prelate, person, state, or potentate, hath or ought to have any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm. I do swear, that I will defend to the utmost of my power the settlement of property within this realm, as established by the laws: and I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present church establishment, as settled by law within this realm: and I do solemnly swear, that I never will exercise any privilege, to which I am, or may become, entitled, to disturb or weaken the protestant religion, or protestant government in the United Kingdom: and I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever.—So help me God.’—*Act for the Relief of his Majesty's Roman Catholic Subjects.* Clause 2.

¹ Clause 18.

² ‘And whereas the right and title of archbishops to their respective provinces, of bishops to their sees, and of deans to their deaneries, as well in England as in Ireland, have been settled and established by law; be it, therefore, enacted, that if

any person, after the commencement of this act, other than the person thereunto authorised by law, shall assume or use the name, style, or title of archbishop of any province, bishop of any bishopric, or dean of any deanery, in England or Ireland, he shall for every such offence forfeit and pay the sum of one hundred pounds.’ Clause 24.

³ ‘If any Roman catholic ecclesiastic, or any member of any of the orders, communities, or societies hereinafter mentioned, shall, after the commencement of this act, exercise any of the rites or ceremonies of the Roman catholic religion, or wear the habits of his order, save within the usual places of worship of the Roman catholic religion, or in private houses, such ecclesiastic or other person shall, being thereof convicted by due course of law, forfeit for every such offence the sum of fifty pounds.’ Clause 26.

⁴ Religious or monastic societies of women are expressly exempted by clause 37.

⁵ ‘And whereas Jesuits, and members of other religious orders, communities, or societies of the church of *Rome*, bound by monastic or religious vows, are resident within the United Kingdom, and it is expedient to make provision for the gradual suppression and final prohibition of the same therein.’ Clause 28.

⁶ The penalty for omitting to register within this time is fifty pounds for every calendar month during which the party shall remain unregistered.

⁷ Clause 29.

⁸ Clause 30.

person might be licenced by the secretary of state, being a protestant, to come into the kingdom, and remain there for a space not exceeding six calendar months.¹ All future admissions into such orders within the United Kingdom were to be misdemeanors in the admitting parties, punishable by fine and imprisonment: the parties admitted were made liable to banishment.² These provisions against monastic orders are obviously just and reasonable. From such combinations, moving at the will of a small knot of alien superiors, have come a large portion both of the grosser superstitions, and of the anti-social proceedings of popery. Any state is, therefore, as fully justified in refusing toleration to them, as it is to any combination of artisans, or of political agitators. In withholding such toleration, no right of conscience is invaded, unless there is an interference also with some religious principle or usage. It is, however, notorious, that every integral peculiarity of the Romish creed can have free course without administration from any others than secular clergymen, that is, from a body of ecclesiastics analogous to protestant ministers of religion. If Romanism cannot be extended, or even maintained, without skillfully organised combinations in aid of ordinary ministers, it has plainly no right to expect shelter from a protestant nation for such auxiliaries; blemished as they are too in character, by the most serious imputations, even from those of their own religious persuasion. Extraordinary facilities for its designs and operations cannot be reasonably expected from a people which views its principles as unsound and pernicious.³

§ 14. There are few subjects upon which a religious Englishman can think with less pleasure than upon the slight attention long paid by his country to the spiritual wants of her colonies. When Romish governments plant any considerable number of their people upon some distant shore, they have rarely omitted to establish an episcopal see among them within a very short period. The English government long rooted valuable and extensive colonies in almost every quarter of the globe, without making any religious provision for them beyond the supply of a few unconnected and unsupported clergymen.⁴

¹ Clause 31.

² Clauses 33, 34.

³ [These enactments against monastic establishments have remained to all intents and purposes a dead letter. In the year 1854, an attempt was made to get a committee of the House of Commons to inquire into the matter; but although the committee was granted, the persevering efforts of the Irish members prevented the nomination of it, and the whole thing was abortive. In 1853 the convents in the United Kingdom were 203, and there were 72 monasteries in Ireland. In 1858 there were in England 23 houses of monks and 107 nunneries. *Ed.*]

⁴ [The importance of securing the North American colonies to the Church, and their undeniable right to a complete

organisation, had been pressed on successive governments by Laud in 1638: by Clarendon, under whom Dr. A. Murray was actually appointed Bishop of Virginia, but never consecrated: by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, from its foundation: by Gibson, Sherlock, Secker, Terriek, and Lowth. These representations were defeated, partly by indifference at home, partly by Puritan opposition in New England. In 1723, two bishops, Talbot and Welton, were consecrated for America by the non-jurors, but these were forbidden by the government to exercise their functions. See *Documents relative to the Colonial Bishoprics*, by Ernest Hawkins, London, 1855. *Ed.*]

The first individual of weight and influence who successfully drew attention to this discreditable and impolitic omission was the religious and high-minded Shute Barrington, then bishop of Salisbury, but who died, at a patriarchal age, bishop of Durham. This admirable prelate, in 1786, offered to the notice of Mr. Pitt's administration, a valuable and judicious paper, entitled *Thoughts on the Establishment of the Church of England in Nova Scotia*. In this he recommended the appointment of a bishop, a provision for the established clergy, and a seminary for clerical education.¹ All these recommendations were eventually adopted, and in 1787 a bishop was appointed to the diocese of Nova Scotia, being the first colonial bishop that the church of England ever commissioned. An endowment for this new prelacy was provided by means of a fund that originated in a legacy of 1,000*l.*, left by archbishop Tenison in 1715, towards the settlement of bishops in America, and which subsequent benefactions increased. In 1793, a second Anglo-American prelate was consecrated; his see being Quebec, and his diocese Canada.² For England's enormous Indian empire, no episcopal provision was made when the eighteenth century closed: a few chaplains, appointed by the East India Company, were the only symptoms of any care for the spiritual interests of those numerous natives of the British isles who sought subsistence or advancement in Hindostan, and of whom a large proportion never returned to enjoy again the religious privileges of their mother-country. There were, indeed, occasionally heard animadversions upon the imperfect and niggardly provision made for the eternal welfare of so many expatriated Christians, and occasionally the appointment of a bishop was recommended. But this latter was usually represented as a project which could not be entertained by any discreet person anxious to preserve the British power. The native population was thought likely to take instant alarm, if it saw a prelate land, being nearly certain to consider him as the harbinger of some forced conversion. In such apprehensions, however, the more discerning and strenuous friends of episcopacy did not participate. When, accordingly, a renewal of the East India Company's charter came under parliamentary discussion in 1813, the project of establishing a bishopric in the great oriental peninsula was actively canvassed, and gained largely upon the public approval. Parliament was, however, cautious in sanctioning the plan. It was not until extensive inquiries were made, and the safety of the proposed measure fully established by sufficient evidence, that legislative authority was given for the foundation of an Indian see. These preliminaries having been terminated satisfactorily, when the East India Company's charter was renewed in 1814, a warm discussion in the House of Commons ended in the passing of resolutions for the appointment of a bishop, and of three archdeacons. The prelate appointed was Thomas Fanshaw Middleton, known as the learned author of *The doctrine of the Greek Article applied to the Criticism*

¹ Harford's *Life of Bishop Burgess*, p. 394, Lond. 1840.

² *Quarterly Review*, No. 149, p. 21.

and Illustration of the New Testament, and as an exemplary, energetic clergyman. Even after this appointment, so dubious were many upon the policy of sending a bishop to India, that the archbishop of Canterbury forbore to pay the customary compliment of desiring the consecration sermon to be published, for fear of causing any needless excitement in the public mind. All these alarms proved wholly unfounded: but they were suffered to cast a shadow even over the new bishop's arrival in his diocese. He landed with no more notice from the constituted authorities than if he had come over to fill some inferior station. Eventually all such unworthy misgivings were abandoned, and native respect for Britain obviously increased, when she was at last seen to place her religion upon a becoming and efficient footing. Bishop Middleton's vast diocese proved, however, too much for his physical powers, although these were apparently above the average, and he died suddenly, in July, 1822. His successor also, the amiable Reginald Heber, conspicuous alike for poetic talent, moral worth, and religious feelings, soon sank under the fatigues and anxieties of a cure so much above the ordinary strength of man. Nor were the two succeeding prelates found more equal to such a task. They too fell early victims to labours which an European might find excessive in the temperate region of his birth, but can scarcely hope to bear under an Indian sun. This truth, at length, was duly felt, and the fifth Indian bishop was relieved from a large portion of that weighty charge which overwhelmed his predecessors. He is bishop of Calcutta and metropolitan. For each of the two other presidencies, Madras and Bombay, a bishopric was erected in 1837. In the West Indies two bishops were appointed in the year 1824; one being seated in Jamaica, the other in Barbadoes.

§ 15. Among the religious movements of latter years, few have been conceived with sounder wisdom, and executed with greater liberality, than the provision of new seminaries for academical instruction. The lead was taken in remedying national deficiencies of this kind by the late amiable, pious, and learned bishop Burgess. Having been most deservedly promoted to the see of St. David's, in 1803, he soon became shocked and surprised at the prevalence of dissent in his diocese. This evil he considered as partly owing to clerical inefficiency, and that evil again to the difficulty of commanding a university education with persons bred in comparative poverty, and likely to live in it. Young men were commonly presented for ordination who had only spent one year previously at the seminary from which they were expected to appear before the bishop.¹ Up to this brief beginning of their higher studies, they had usually been employed in the ordinary labours of their paternal farms. As a preliminary measure towards a succession better qualified for their profession, bishop Burgess licenced four schools for the education of candidates for holy orders, and required an attendance of seven years upon one of them. Still these places of instruction could not possess the character and advantages

¹ Harford's *Bp. Burgess*, p. 225.

of an institution exclusively meant for intellectual training of a higher grade. Such, therefore, it became the bishop's earnest endeavour to provide. For this object he regularly set apart a tenth of his episcopal revenue, and he prevailed upon his clergy, straitened as they generally were in circumstances, to do the same with their several benefices. By these sacrifices, so truly noble when the general condition of those who made them is considered, several thousand pounds were raised after a perseverance of eighteen years. The fund thus raised was augmented by lay subscriptions within the principality, and by liberal donations from England, one of a thousand pounds coming from George IV. By these various means a college was founded at Lampeter, in Cardiganshire, on the site of an ancient castle, which had wholly disappeared. It was a most inviting spot, healthy in itself, and looking down upon a beautifully-watered vale, shut in by lofty hills. Here was laid the first stone of the new building in 1822, and the erection was completed in 1827. [In 1852 this institution received by royal charter the right to confer a degree of bachelor of divinity on its ordained members of five years' standing.] The excellent prelate whose exertions called it into being was translated to the see of Salisbury in 1825, and he died possessed of that preferment in 1837. He did not, however, lose his interest in the college of Lampeter by removal from South Wales. To it he bequeathed his noble library, with a sum of money for providing the collection with a suitable apartment.¹ In 1828 an academical institution, connected with the church of England, was founded by subscription, in London. It was called King's College, in honour of George IV., then on the throne, who aided the undertaking by his countenance and liberality. A similar institution had already been set on foot in the metropolis, but upon the principle of leaving religious questions entirely to the students themselves. Many people thought this likely to prove a seminary hostile to the national church, and were, therefore, anxious to provide another, which might offer the same educational advantages, but inculcate a different bias. Within a short time afterwards, another academical institution, and one of a very dignified and effective character, was established at Durham. The distance of the northern counties from the two universities had long been felt as a considerable disadvantage, especially by young men intended for the church. In their case, indeed, it often led to that necessity for the admission of inferior clerical attainments, which acted so injuriously upon Wales. The expediency of founding a university at Durham had, accordingly, been frequently suggested, and a project of this kind was, much to Cromwell's honour, under his consideration. It slumbered, however, until the prelacy of bishop Van Mildert, one of the best divines and most public-spirited men of his day, who, notwithstanding the deficiency of private fortune, would hardly be outdone in liberality by his wealthy predecessor, Barrington. The example of such a diocesan was not lost upon the opulent chapter of his cathedral. That

¹ Harford's *Bp. Burgess*, p. 506.

body honourably determined upon sacrificing a considerable portion of its endowments to remove the academical deficiency, which had been an immemorial subject of complaint in northern England. By an act of parliament, obtained in 1832, it alienated property producing nearly 3,000*l.* a year, to found the contemplated university. That most beneficial institution, which offers advantages analogous to those of Oxford and Cambridge, was opened in October, 1833. A royal charter, granted on the 1st of June, 1837, gave it all the privileges of the elder universities, and accordingly, on the 8th of that month, its first degrees were conferred. For its use was appropriated the ancient castle of Durham. This was immemorably a place of occasional residence for the prelates of that once princely see, and it was worthy of them. It is a commanding pile, proudly sharing with its venerable neighbour, the massive Anglo-Norman cathedral, the crest of that unrivalled rock that shoots with wooded sides above the Wear. Never did the ecclesiastical magnificence of former days find a happier field for its display than at Durham, and hardly anywhere did it work with greater liberality and judgment. Thus England's tardy acquisition of a third university has not at length been made, without an ample share of those advantages for impressing youthful minds of taste and generous feeling, that recommend elder institutions in the south.

§ 16. In the United States of America great progress has been made by the protestant episcopal church during the nineteenth century. It seems now to number about a million and a half of members. Its clergy, in 1844, amounted to 1,224.¹ The Protestant Episcopalians are, however, among the wealthiest and most intelligent of the people. Hence their numbers are certain steadily to increase with the growing opulence and information of the country. In 1802 this interesting branch of the catholic church identified herself completely with her elder sister in the British isles, by adopting the Thirty-nine Articles. There was much debate before a step so decided was taken, but in the end it was thought advisable to accept the Anglican formulary exactly as it stood, leaving even its phraseology wholly untouched. But while the American church was daily enlarging her boundaries, it became obvious that she could not do herself justice without facilities of her own for academical instruction. Public attention was called to this matter in 1814, and in three years afterwards arrangements were made for establishing a theological seminary upon church principles at New York.² This institution has led the way for others of the same kind, and thus North-American churchmen will, at no great distance of time, be sufficiently supplied with a competent ministry. It is obvious that their principles require this advantage before they can become extensively popular. In England, besides the higher orders, the church is generally followed by the poor: it is chiefly among the inferior sections of the middle classes that dissent flourishes. In America it would, probably, be found much the same, if there were a well-trained church clergy brought fully into contact with the population.

¹ Wilberforce's *History of the Protestant Episcopal Church in America*, p. 398.

² Caswall's *America and the American Church*, p. 188.

[§ 17. The early portion of the nineteenth century may be considered to end in 1830. In that year, the death of George IV. removed the principal obstacle from the way of that political party in England whose aim was to destroy the ancient balance of constitution in church and state. The elder house of Bourbon was expelled from France by a second revolution, the effects of which extended to the Netherlands, Italy, and Germany. Pope Pius VIII. died the same winter. The disturbances in the Spanish peninsula and in Greece were quickly approaching their catastrophe. All the European nations were awakening from their uneasy slumber of fifteen years, and all the different branches of the church preparing for the internal and external struggles which have constituted the history of the present generation. Here, then, the annalist of the church pauses, as before the beginning of a new era.]

CONTINUATION OF THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.*

§ 1. Plan of the Chapter—§ 2. Character of the period—§ 3. Revolution—§ 4. Reaction—§ 5. Common life of the Churches—§ 6. Ancient Eastern Church—§ 7. Crimean War—§ 8. Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem—§ 9. Patriarchate of Constantinople—§ 10. Hellenic Church—§ 11. Servian, Bulgarian, and Armenian Churches—§ 12. Russian Church—§ 13. The Papacy—§ 14. Gallican Church—§ 15. German Roman Church in Prussia—§ 16. in the other States—§ 17. Its internal condition—§ 18. The Roman Church in Switzerland—§ 19. in Belgium—§ 20. in Spain, Portugal, and Italy—§ 21. Lutheran Church; decline of theology—§ 22. Philosophy takes the place—§ 23. Rationalism—§ 24. Schleiermacher—§ 25. Church government—§ 26. Revival of religion—§ 27. Later Neology—§ 28. Sweden—§ 29. Denmark and Norway—§ 30. Reformed Church in Switzerland—§ 31. in Holland—§ 32. Church of England—§ 33. Rise of parties—§ 34. Evangelical School—§ 35. Irish temporalities attacked, and the consequences—§ 36. Oxford Tracts—§ 37. Church progress—§ 38. Church societies—§ 39. Controversies—§ 40. Papal aggression—§ 41. Revival of Convocation—§ 42. Church Finance Reform—§ 43. Attacks of Dissenters—§ 44. Revision of the Liturgy—§ 45. Liberal party—§ 46. Later controversies—§ 47. Church of Scotland—§ 48. Church of Ireland—§ 49. Church in America—§ 50. Presbyterian Church in Scotland—§ 51. Conclusion.

§ 1. In attempting a retrospect of the ecclesiastical history of the last thirty years, on so small a scale as is admissible in a book like this, it will be advisable to recur to an arrangement something like that adopted in the earlier portions of the work, and to review in succession the history of the several branches of the church, in its internal and external aspects. Not but that a general view is possible and in some respects more desirable; for the influences which have affected the inner and outer relations of one church have seldom been without effect on others. More, perhaps, than in any former age, the bearing of one member upon another has been visible and marked, and the interpenetration of mutual as well as common influences been traceable throughout. It might seem more philosophical to attempt a comparative estimate of these; but it would open manifold ways of error: it would lead us into a risk of presumptuous criticism upon facts and opinions whose bearings are hardly apparent now, or appreciable from our own standing-point; whose directions can only be guessed, whose forces we are not yet

* By the present Editor.

able at all to estimate, the very circumstances of which we cannot generalise from without a great danger of being misled by party feeling and prejudice. Whatever, then, our plan may lose in a philosophical point of view, may be more than compensated by certainty and order: we shall be able to take up the threads that are left hanging at various lengths by the author and his continuator, and an adhesion to sober fact may save us the future trouble of having to explain away or recant our own prophesyings.

§ 2. The nineteenth century has witnessed a war of principles from its very beginning. The shock of the French revolution aroused the nations of Europe to a sense as well of weakness as of strength: it showed the people the vast might and momentum of popular power, and taught the princes that the reign of unquestioning obedience was over for ever. The principles which it proclaimed were received at the outset with sympathy and admiration by all the nations in which the idea of freedom yet lingered. The whole world was to be speedily and effectually regenerated by them. But the atrocities which followed the opening glories of the great awakening almost immediately repelled the sympathy, and turned admiration into horror. Still more, when anarchy resulted in the tyranny of a military despotism which maintained itself by the oppression of foreign nations, the idea of revolution became itself repulsive, and a return to the old degenerate system for a time seemed desirable. The shaking off of the yoke of France was, under God, the work of the nations. The spirit of freedom roused and developed in the struggle demanded under the restored rulers its due share in constitutional government, and strove for still further and freer development. The princes, on the other hand, thought that the safest guarantee of order was paternal government on Christian principles, in which, according to their idea, the great duty of the subject is to obey. On these principles the Holy Alliance was to govern all the world. Hence have arisen the political struggles which both in war and in peace have occupied the last five-and-forty years.

§ 3. The causes that affect politics are never without their action on religion. Christianity, renounced and trampled on by the French revolution, had been one of the great inspiring causes that worked the liberation of Europe. Religion raised its head throughout the continent; princes were to rule religiously henceforth; the nations were full of a practical sense of restored Christianity. But it was forgotten that religion, although the safest guarantee of order, cannot flourish but in freedom. The church, in Roman Catholic countries, was found in close alliance with absolutism: in the Protestant countries of the continent, it was treated only as a department in the state. In both it was in an attitude unfortunately repugnant to men in whose minds liberty occupied the first place. Too soon liberty and revolution became again convertible terms, and both the extreme liberals and their opponents counted the name of liberalism equivalent to infidelity. Generally, throughout Roman Catholic Europe, an approach to constitutional government resulted in revolution, and

the first measure of revolution was universally an attack on the church in its most vulnerable point, power and property. Something of the same sort took place in Protestant countries, but in them the power of liberalism was exerted in a more subtle way than oppression and persecution—in the loosening of the terms of communion and attempts to adapt the forms and creeds to the spirit of an age which, having learned by experience that political power springs from the people, had superadded, of its own invention, that the only rule and criterion of religious truth is public opinion. England alone has escaped these evils: here the principles of freedom were not strange, the spirit of religion was not intolerant; the revolutionary party had never triumphed; nor were the excesses on either side so great as to require correction by a strong reaction. In consequence, the religious character of the century has been hitherto one of constant, though not uniform, progress and enlightenment. Still the church has had her struggles. One school of liberals has attacked her doctrines, and another her endowments. Hitherto, it has pleased God to bring out of their hostile measures greater progress, greater effort, and increased consciousness of vitality.

§ 4. The tyranny of liberalism resulted in a fresh reaction. The feeling which in England rallied the learning and piety of the nation to the church, was aroused throughout the continent. This time it was not merely a political but a spiritual revival, and, as such, a progress rather than a reaction. It exhibited itself differently, according to the different characteristics of nations and churches, but in all tended towards an increased regard to primitive truth and an increased energy in Christian works. If the cause of truth and piety has taken up again the arms by which former victories were won, it has been to wield them against foes which have been thrice conquered, and which have only reared their heads again because the weapons they dreaded seemed too heavy for the hands of a weaker generation. Increased vigour and learning are required, humanly speaking, to meet the renewed attacks of old heathenism, in its guise of indifferentism, of secularism, or of rationalistic philosophy. And they are not wanting.

§ 5. Nor must it be forgotten that the present century has seen the different parts of the world brought much closer together than they were before. First war and revolution made east and west, north and south, sharers in calamity: a common victory united all Europe in a common joy. The long peace had the effect of vastly increasing mutual acquaintance and sympathy, and of late the result of this improved acquaintance has been to make every civilised state an object of interest to every other. Political affinities have been discovered; political capabilities of younger states have been developed and fostered with the sympathies of the elder; political interests and principles have been weighed against one another, and in conjunction. The possibility of a republic of nations has seemed at times nearly a reality. The great Christian powers have their work in Asia and America as well as in Europe. The pulse of England beats

through North America, South Asia, Africa, and Australia. Northern Asia and America form a field for great work on the part of Russia. The impotence of the Spanish and Portuguese kingdoms in Europe is reflected by their colonies from the other side of the Atlantic. No great movement of any sort takes place in one continent without a vast sensation in the others. It would be strange if nations, brought together in every secular respect, could still be kept from an interest in the spiritual welfare of each other. Curiosity is aroused, interference is attempted, missionary and auxiliary projects are taken in hand with different purposes, with various powers, merit, and success. A new philosophy, originating in the centre of Europe, runs east and west; a new heresy gathers its adherents throughout the old world, and settles down in the farthest west of the new; a new doctrine of church and state relations spreads from land to land, and meets with defence on common principles. And these things are but in their beginning.

§ 6. Of the ancient eastern churches there is not much to be said. Their stationary character, in doctrine, ritual, and government, leaves little room for internal history; and the fact that the several branches are so generally exactly coincident with the nationalities that maintain each, renders their external church history and their secular history one. In the regions in which Christian nations are ruled by the Mussulmans, notwithstanding the efforts of western diplomacy, a wretched mercenary despotism still prevails. Throughout the Turkish empire, the sense of weakness has failed to teach toleration. Frequent massacres of Christians are still perpetrated, either by the independent border tribes of the empire or by insurgent populations, at whose enormities the central government has connived. These and the other oppressive measures which were exercised on the Christians, led, long ago, to a sort of protectorate on the part of the western powers, which, although it has on several occasions proved ineffectual either to stem the tide of oppression or to obtain redress for injuries, is recognised thankfully by the churches of the east. Russia is the protector of the Orthodox and Armenians, France of the Uniates¹ and of the schismatic churches which show a tendency to Rome, and the converts of the Protestant missions look naturally for aid to America and England. It was chiefly owing to the exertions of Sir Stratford Canning, the English envoy at Constantinople, that, since 1843, conversions from Mahometanism to Christianity have ceased to be punished with death, and that, in 1846, the Protestant converts were recognised officially. It is a misfortune almost inseparable from the circumstances of the case, that, under the shadow of this protection, a system of proselytism prevails, that leads to unreal and interested conversions, prejudicial in an extreme degree to the cause of practical

¹ The extent to which religious animosity was carried in France on the eastern question may be judged by the declaration of archbishop Sibour that the Russian war of 1854 was not undertaken in order to bridle

the ambition of Russia, or to prevent the dismemberment of Turkey, but for the humiliation of the Photians. *Chr. Remembrancer*, Jan. 1857, p. 200.

religion. Another effect has been the jealousy caused between France and Russia on the question of the holy places—a subject which went far to exasperate the feelings which broke out into war between Russia and Turkey, supported by France and England, in 1853. A victorious decision of that war might have resulted in an actual amelioration of the state of the eastern Christians; but the Porte could not refuse to its Christian allies concessions equal to any that could have been wrung from it by a triumphant enemy. A short review of these circumstances is necessary.

§ 7. The immemorial struggles, at the court of Constantinople, between French and Russian diplomacy, on the question of the holy places, had, in 1852, come to such a crisis that a general European war was apprehended. The czar Nicolas of Russia, representing the interests of the ancient eastern churches, was to the last degree unwilling to see the claims of the Latins, which were upheld by France, triumphant; and the conduct of the Turkish government towards its Christian subjects gave him a ready excuse for an appeal to arms. In March 1853, the czar, prompted no doubt by views of conquest, but also disgusted with the impotency and insincerity of the Porte, went so far as to demand such guarantees of the safety and freedom of the Greek subjects of the sultan as would be fatal to the independence of the latter. After several months of negotiation, during which the sultan attempted to show that the guarantees were not required for the safety of the Christians, and to appease the czar by minor concessions, diplomatic relations were broken off on the 21st of May, and on the 6th of June the sultan directed a firman to the heads of the Christian churches, confirming all their privileges, and undertaking to redress their grievances. This was insufficient to satisfy Russia, and on the 2nd of July her forces crossed the Pruth. In February 1854, the diplomatic relations of England and France with Russia were broken off; and, on the 12th of March, a treaty was concluded between the former powers and Turkey. The same day, a protocol was drawn up, which was issued at Constantinople on the 8th of May, declaring the equality, in the eye of the law, of all the subjects of the Porte, their admissibility to public employments without difference of religion, the right of the Christian subjects to bear witness in the courts of justice, the establishment of mixed tribunals, and the abolition of the poll-tax. The war proclaimed on the 28th of the same month lasted nearly two years. In December 1855, Austria proposed five points of agreement between the contending powers, by the fourth of which the welfare of the Christians was to be secured. In anticipation of peace, a hatti-scheriff was issued on the 18th of February, which promised a confirmation of all the ancient privileges of the Christians, the nomination of the patriarchs for life, separate administrations for the Christian communities, equality of religions and nationalities, abolition of the punishment of death for change of religion, right of building churches, establishment of schools, and representation of Christians in the council of state. A week after this, the negotiations for peace opened, and the treaty of Paris was

concluded on the 31st of March. By this treaty, article 9, the Porte communicated this firman to the other contracting powers, and, the following day, the emperor Alexander II. published a manifesto, declaring that the primary and principal object of the war had been obtained.¹

Without suspecting the good faith of the Turkish government in making these concessions, it may be doubted whether it has power to secure their maintenance in the remoter provinces of the empire. Within a few days of the peace, the Moslems of Nablous rose against the Christians; in 1858 occurred the cruel massacre at Jeddah, on the 15th of June, in which the French and English authorities were murdered; and the same year witnessed similar risings in Crete and at Gaza. In 1860, the Christians of Damascus were massacred by the Mahometans, and the struggle between the Druses and Maronites followed, in consequence of which Syria was occupied by the French until June 1861.²

§ 8. In the ancient see of Alexandria, the orthodox or Melchite church still possesses a patriarch. In 1672 he had four bishops under him, honoured with the title of metropolitans: three of these have now ceased to exist. The patriarch, however, is still styled pope and patriarch of the great city of Alexandria, and œcumenical judge, and the office seems to be an object of ambition, as there was a contested election for it in 1846.³ Of the Melchite Christians no actual enumeration has been made: they are probably a mere handful. The national church of Egypt, the Coptic or Jacobite, has a patriarch and thirteen bishops:⁴ these preserve many particulars of primitive practice, and considerable literary treasures. The Abyssinian church, a daughter of the Coptic, retains and has exaggerated the peculiarities of the latter. European missionaries, Roman and Protestant, have in turn assailed these with very little practical effect.⁵ The Romanists do indeed claim two millions of Uniats in Abyssinia, but it is difficult to estimate either the truth of the assertion or the character of the conversions; and, to all intents and purposes, Abyssinia remains singular in the world as a semi-savage Christian state.

The patriarchate of Antioch contains, besides the orthodox church, the Nestorians, the Jacobite or Syrian church, the Maronite church, and the Indians of St. Thomas. The orthodox patriarch lives at Damascus,⁶ and has still sixteen bishops under him. The number of orthodox families in this diocese, in 1844, was 25,836; but this includes the autocephalous province of Cyprus, governed by a metropolitan and five bishops.⁷

¹ In September 1859, the Bey of Tunis, at the demand of France, enacted some religious reforms. *Almanach de Gotha*, 1859.

² See *Colonial Church Chronicle*, October, 1860.

³ Neale, *Patriarchate of Alexandria*, ii. 475.

⁴ Neale, *Holy Eastern Church*, i. 117.

⁵ The English Church Missionary Society

sent out Dr. Gobat, in 1827, to Abyssinia. This mission was discontinued in 1842. Dr. Gobat described the church as divided into three parties on a minute point of the Monophysite controversy.

⁶ See an interesting account, by Mr. George Williams, of his visit to the patriarch, the schools, &c., in the *Colonial Church Chronicle* for 1860, p. 231.

⁷ *Holy Eastern Church*, i. 137.

The Syrian Jacobites have a patriarch at Caramit, honoured with the name of Ignatius, eight metropolitans, and three bishops.

The Nestorians¹ continued in the condition described by Mosheim, in his seventeenth century, until 1778. The mountain Nestorians had their patriarch, Mar Simon, at Ooromiyah; those of the plains owned subjection to the patriarch Mar Elias, the successor of Simeon Bar Mama, at Mosul; and there was a Chaldean or Uniat schism in alliance with Rome, whose patriarch bore the name of Mar Yoosef, and resided at Karamit. In 1778, Mar Elias of Mosul seceded to Rome, and the Chaldean patriarchate was declared by the pope to be abolished; but the existing Mar Yoosef continued to exercise his patriarchal rights there until his death in 1828. The succession to Mar Elias was disputed, and a period of confusion ensued. The pope, however, succeeded in suppressing the hereditary succession of the patriarchs, and, in 1841, appointed Mutran Zeyya patriarch of the Chaldeans, thus consolidating the two offices. The Nestorian patriarchate now contains 11,378 families, and the Chaldean (Uniat) 2,743.

The Jacobite and Nestorian churches, not possessing that protection from Russia which has been granted to their orthodox brethren, have been reduced to a very low state, and subjected to much persecution. The hope of French protection has no doubt drawn great numbers of them to the church of Rome; and the American Independent missions have been at work amongst them.

Both these communities have suffered very severely from the Koords. Bedr Khan Beg, of Jezeerah, who ruled quite irrespective of the Turkish government, in 1843 massacred 10,000 Nestorians in the Tiary districts, and followed up this by persecution of the Jacobites of Jebel-Toor. In the latter the Maphrian of Midyât was murdered, his heart cut out and carried to Bedr Khan Beg, and his body dragged at a horse's tail. In 1845 the atrocities were renewed, and five hundred Nestorians slain, with three hundred women and as many children. Strong remonstrances were used by the western powers to the Porte on this occasion, and Bedr Khan Beg was sent to exile in Crete.²

The Christians of St. Thomas, having in the seventeenth century become Jacobites, still receive their bishops from Mosul; but the encroachments of Rome have reduced them to about 50,000. That church claims the rest of the Malabar Christians as Uniat, about 150,000 in number. In 1862, however, the church of Travancore obtained a bishop from Mesopotamia, and to him about 81,000 of the Uniat have adhered.³

The patriarchate of Jerusalem contains about 15,000 orthodox Greeks, who are governed by six metropolitans, six archbishops, and a bishop. The patriarchs, who since 1554 have invariably been Greeks, have their settled residence at Constantinople: they exercise

¹ Badger, *The Nestorians and their Rituals*, i. 60.

² *Ibid.* 303—373.

³ *Colonial Church Chronicle*, September, 1862.

their authority through *guardians* of the patriarchate, and nominate coadjutors with the right of succession.¹ The archbishopric of Sinai is autocephalous.

§ 9. By far the largest portion of the Greek church, exclusive of Russia, acknowledges the obedience of the patriarch of Constantinople. The orthodox under his care amount to not much less than twelve millions. The annals of the œcumenical throne contain, unhappily, little else than a series of purchases, depositions, exiles, and murders. The church is not exempt from the universal taint of bribery that pervades the Turkish empire. The patriarch is, indeed, elected by the synod,² but he is obliged to purchase investiture from the sultan, and this implies no certainty of tenure. The nomination of the patriarchs for life was promised by the hattî-humayoun of 1856; but, in spite of this, the patriarch Cyril was in 1858 deposed on the old charge of simony and waste of the patriarchal finances.³ Where such transactions are necessary in the highest quarter, it is no wonder that the lower clergy are widely accused of simoniacal dealings. The patriarchs strenuously resist this, but hitherto, owing to their own uncertain position, without much effect. Their political position is also most embarrassing: united as they are by every tie to Russia, they are still bound, as good subjects, to take a part in the defence against her aggression. Sympathising heartily with the struggling and emancipated Greeks, they are unable to raise a finger in their behalf. A terrible instance of this occurred in the war of liberation. In 1821, Gregory, patriarch of Constantinople, who had been cognisant, whilst a private priest, of the plans of the insurgent Greeks, and had not revealed them on his elevation, was put to death in the following way:—On Easter-eve, the whole quarter in which the patriarchate is situated was occupied by janissaries. Gregory performed the midnight service in his cathedral. At dawn the dragoman of the Porte invited him to a conference in the hall of his palace. A firman was read for his deposition, and for a new election, which was at once proceeded with. Whilst Eugenius, bishop of Pisidia, was being invested as his successor, Gregory was hanged on Easter Sunday at the door of the patriarchate; his body was exposed for three days, and then delivered to the Jews, according to the barbarous custom, to be cast into the sea. Gregory met his death with the dignity and courage of a martyr; and his body, being taken up by the faithful, was carried to Odessa, where it was received by the Russians as a holy relic.⁴

The gradual decomposition of the Turkish empire is thus in itself a source of great difficulty to the patriarchs; but there are said to

¹ Neale, *Holy Eastern Church*, i. 160—162. There is a printing press at Jerusalem belonging to the Greeks, at which, among many other works, were printed, in 1855, a commentary on the Psalms by the patriarch Anthimus, edited by Dionysius Cleopas, teacher of theology in the patriarchal school; Commentary on the Revela-

tion, also by Anthimus, in 1856; and 41 Homilies of Gregory of Thessalonica, in 1857.

² Neale, *Holy East. Ch.* i. 50.

³ Döllinger, *The Church and the Churches*, p. 124.

⁴ Finlay, *History of the Greek Revolution*, i. 229.

exist in the Greek church itself two parties, one Slavonic, relying on Russia, and the other Hellenic. These parties are, however, strictly political; and although, as long as the Turkish empire lasts, they are an element of discord, they cannot be thought to indicate any such disruption of the orthodox church as the Romanists of the west are anxiously desiring.¹

§ 10. Those provinces which have either entirely, or all but in name, detached themselves from the Turkish empire, possess independent and flourishing churches in communion with Constantinople. The revolution in Greece interrupted all ecclesiastical relations between the patriarch and his Hellenic provinces. It was impossible, in fact, for a patriotic clergy to own allegiance to a superior who, however friendly to them, was bound hand and foot by their bitterest enemy. Hence they ceased to pray for the patriarch, and used the forms of prayer for the orthodox church which are in use in the other eastern patriarchates. When Capodistrias became president, in 1827, the patriarch attempted to renew the connexion, but the murder of Gregory was alleged as a reason sufficient for refusing to acknowledge a patriarch under the sultan's influence. In July 1833, a synod at Nauplia, of thirty-six bishops, declared in two propositions the future status of their church. By the first, it was provided that she preserves unshaken dogmatic unity with the eastern orthodox churches, under the king of Greece as supreme administrator: by the second, a permanent synod was established on the pattern of the holy governing synod of Russia. In December the same year, the new kingdom was definitely divided into ten dioceses. The regency had suppressed all monasteries of less than six monks, or of which the buildings were destroyed: these were 412 in number.

A reaction followed these radical measures of reform, and the scheme of government was opposed by strong parties under both Russian and Turkish influence. It was found that the synod appointed by king Otho had no power to consecrate bishops; and when the revolution of 1843 took place, several sees were vacant. In 1850 secret negotiations were opened with the patriarch, and he and his synod published a *synodical tomos*, recognising the independence of the Hellenic church under certain conditions. Objections were made in Greece to this act, as if the acceptance of it implied a subseriency to foreign interference. But in 1852 the terms of it were enacted by the Greek Chambers, though without mentioning the *tomos*. By this fundamental law, the kingdom is divided into twenty-four dioceses; the metropolitan of Athens is president of the synod, and there are ten archbishops and thirteen simple bishops, appointed by the king on the nomination of three fit persons by the synod. A strong party spirit was evoked by these events; the liberals opposing and the church party supporting the decree, under the names of the parties of the *Tomos* and of the *Anti-tomos*.²

¹ Döllinger, *The Church and the Churches*, 124, 125.

² See Finlay, *History of the Greek Revolu-*

tion, ii. 314, &c. *Annuaire des deux Mondes*, 1852—1853, p. 655.

§ 11. The Servian church anciently recognised the primacy of Constantinople, without acknowledging the patriarchal jurisdiction. Its head, in 1354, was elected patriarch of Servia, and the title was recognised at Rome. This state of things continued until 1689, when the Servian patriarch Arsenius, with 37,000 families, having joined the emperor Leopold against the Turks, was obliged to emigrate into Hungary. The sultan then established an independent patriarchate of his own, which lasted until 1765. From that time to 1830 Servia was a province of Constantinople; in that year its administrative independence was recognised, and the Servians elected their own chief pastor, with the title of metropolitan of Belgrade. The Servian emigrants in Hungary are now a flourishing church, under an archbishop and eleven bishops. The archbishop of Carlowitz, in Hungary, has a million and a half of orthodox Greeks under him. The total number in the Austrian dominions is nearly three millions. Moldavia and Wallachia have, since their emancipation, an independent church administration. The same may be said of Montenegro.¹

The Bulgarian church, which, in earlier times, had shown symptoms of wavering between Rome and Constantinople, has lately aspired again to an independent patriarchate. In 1860, the Jesuits endeavoured, with partial success, to found a Uniat church in this country, and were joined by some of the discontented clergy; and, in 1861, the pope consecrated Sokolski archbishop of the united Bulgarians. The new archbishop returned, however, in August the same year, into the bosom of the orthodox church.²

The Armenian church³ was reduced to its lowest degradation in the middle of the eighteenth century. From that time, under the patronage of Russia, it went on improving, and is now the most important Christian communion in the east, next to the Russian. In 1760, Catharine II. granted letters of protection to the Catholicos Simeon. In 1828, Etchmiadzin became a part of the Russian empire; and, in 1830, the Armenian church was recognised by the state. In 1842, the emperor granted a free election of the Catholicos.⁴ This community has been always distinguished for zeal in the cause of education, and, by the wealth, enterprise, and intelligence of its members, is calculated to take a lead in the regeneration of the east.

§ 12. The Russian church, under its holy governing synod, has enjoyed a century and a half of comparative rest and real progress, such as the churches of the west might, during the same period, have envied. Even the irreligious sovereigns, who occupied the throne during the eighteenth century, had penetration enough to discover that a church so thoroughly national might lend an invaluable aid to a

¹ Neale, *Holy Eastern Church*, i. 69—72. The Rev. W. Denton has recently published a work of great interest on this subject, entitled *Servia and the Servians*, London, 1863.

² Karl Matthes, *Allgemeine kirchliche Chronik*, for 1861, p. 159.

³ The Armenian church is governed by

five patriarchs, of whom the Catholicos of Etchmiadzin is the chief, 25 archbishops, and 37 bishops. The community numbers about 2,400,000 in Turkey, 316,967 in Russia, 200,000 in Persia, and 3,513 in Austria. *Almanach de Gotha*, 1862.

⁴ Neale, *Holy Eastern Church*, i. 68.

national throne; whilst from Alexander, notwithstanding his French liberalism, and from Nicolas, in spite of his despotic nature, the church received generous and just treatment. The great power which the autocrat could bring to bear upon it has not been misused. Although all the members of the synod are nominated by the czar, their behaviour has seldom been marked by subserviency, and their advice has generally been respectfully received. The election of bishops, nominally in the hands of the emperor, is virtually decided by the synod; and the notion, so common in the west, that the Russian church is a mere creation of the state, is utterly false.

The relations of this branch of the orthodox church to the ancient patriarchates were curiously affected by a measure which was taken by the latter in the year 1756. By a constitution drawn up by three patriarchs at Constantinople, it was decreed that all baptisms performed otherwise than by trine immersion are heretical and invalid, and, consequently, that all converts from the western churches must be rebaptized. This decree is rejected by the Russian church, which abides by the decision of the councils of Constantinople of 1484, and Moscow of 1667, by which converts from the Latin church are to be received with the chrism only—a privilege which was extended to Lutheran and Calvinist converts, in 1718, by Jeremiah II., patriarch of Constantinople. This difference has not produced any real estrangement between the two churches.¹

The Russian schismatics are still very numerous. There are eight millions of Starovers, or old believers, who resist the reforms introduced by Nikon, and maintain all the peculiarities of rite and usage which were wisely suppressed by Peter the Great. They are found chiefly along the Volga and among the Don Cossacks, but have also a separate settlement in Moscow. Since 1845, they have been organised into six dioceses, under a bishop lent by the orthodox metropolitan from Hungary; and the government and clergy have attempted to incorporate them by allowing them a regular priest, who is permitted to conform to their usages. The more extreme separatists, however, prefer the ministrations of laymen to the services of the priests of the church, and hence they are said to be divided into two parties—the Popofchins, with clergy; and the Bezpopofchins, without. It has been said that the number of Raskolniks has increased of late years, but this is far from certain.²

The most important event in the history of this period is the return of the Uniat Russians to the national church. This schism had begun in 1590, at a time when Poland, as a kingdom, was more powerful than Russia, and political aims were sought in a junction with the Polish church. At the partition of Poland, between two and three millions returned to the eastern church, but the division was not

¹ W. Palmer, *Dissertations on the Orthodox Communion*, 184, &c.

² Döllinger states the increase of Raskolniks between 1840 and 1861 as being from 9,000,000 to 13,000,000: Stanley, in 1861,

makes them 8,000,000. It is certain that many thousands are annually converted to the church. Neale, i. 57. Matthes, 1858, p. 160.

entirely healed until 1839, when two millions, under three bishops, were reconciled.¹ There are still in Russia 2,800,228 Roman Catholics, 380,000 Greek Uniates, 2,000,000 Lutherans, 1,425,784 Jews, besides Mahometans and Buddhists.²

Great pains have been taken by the late sovereigns to ameliorate the condition of the lower clergy. Their income arises, not from tithes, but from the Easter offerings, fees, and glebe. This was put under a commission by Peter the Great, and the greater part of it confiscated by Catharine II. The emperor Nicolas formed a separate fund out of the perverted church property in the hands of the crown, and applied it to the endowment of the poorer dioceses.³

The future destiny of the Russian church is a problem of the greatest interest; and even its present state is so variously represented by different parties, that it is impossible to get a clear view of the truth. The Roman Catholics, of course, describe it as all that is degraded, and the same line has been frequently taken by travellers, who treat with a liberal contempt everything which they have not knowledge of language and history to appreciate. There have never been wanting either pious or learned men in this church. In the reign of Peter I., the names of Theophanes of Plescow, Metrophanes of Voronege, Demetrius of Rostoff, are mentioned with honour. Under Catharine II., Ambrose, archbishop of Moscow, an eminent Hebrew scholar, was martyred by the Raskolniks, in consequence of his having removed a sacred picture to which the people crowded in time of pestilence. Plato, archbishop of Moscow, was described by Joseph II. as the thing best worth seeing in Russia. Philaret, the present metropolitan of Moscow, represents, by his apostolic piety and vast learning, every possible good element in Russia. Innocent, archbishop of Kamschatka, in a reindeer sledge, traverses as an apostle the long chain of pagan islands which unite the northern portions of Asia and America.⁴

Too little is known in England of the learning of the eastern churches generally. It is not indeed to be expected that so scattered a remnant as the Christians of Syria and Egypt should have much to boast: the monasteries of the east never were seats of learning, and are now, in that aspect, little more than depositories of manuscripts which their members have no power of appreciating. All is not, however, blank, as the pope Pius IX. found when he issued his famous encyclic of 1848. The Russian and Armenian churches have always been famous for learned men. The Hellenic church possesses, in the university of Athens, which was founded in 1837, a good and useful school, and to this some of the monasteries of Mount Athos⁵ have

¹ Mouravieff, *History of the Russian Church*, 430.

² *Almanack de Gotha*, 1863.

³ Neale, *Holy Eastern Church*, i. 58.

⁴ Stanley, *Eastern Church*, 411.

⁵ 'It may be doubted how far an educational system can be ingrafted on the present life of this place, as the experiment

was tried in the last century by Eugenius Bulgari of Corfu, who built a school here, which succeeded admirably for a time, and attracted students from all parts of Greece, but failed at last from various causes, and now remains a ruin.' *Vacation Tourists*, 1861, p. 120.

lately sent their younger members. In this respect the Greek kingdom is promising; and the schools at Athens, founded by Dr. Hill, an American chaplain in episcopal orders, are now affording a safe Christian education to the women of the upper classes.¹

§ 13. The position of the papacy, on the restoration of its temporal power in 1814, was highly critical.² Pius VII. was restored with the good-will of Europe, but Europe was not yet recovered from the panic into which revolution and French aggression had thrown it; and Pius was suffered to bring back with him much that had better been left behind. With every virtue of a man and a hero, he had not the genius of a ruler. He was unable to see that the present state of feeling must be followed by a reaction, which he must be ready either to counteract or to guide. That reaction he lived to see, though only in its beginning. His personal character and past experience prevented him from becoming an oppressor, but his reign was repressive of everything like progress. The task of administration before him was twofold—the reorganisation of his own states, and the refounding of the Roman Catholic churches in that part of the continent in which they had been utterly extinguished by the late wars. The principal external work of his reign was the erection of a new ecclesiastical system in Germany, and the conclusion of concordats with Sardinia and Naples.

His work at home was more difficult. There were in the college of cardinals two parties—the Zelanti, headed by cardinal Pacca, the friend and companion of the captivity of Pius; and the Liberali, of whom the foremost was cardinal Consalvi, one of the most able statesmen of the age. The pope's natural leaning was of course to the Zelanti; but he had sense enough to see that all the statesmanlike qualities were on the side of Consalvi, who continued his prime minister until his death. The chief act of Consalvi's administration was the *motu proprio* of 1816, by which the separate constitutions of the several Roman states were abolished, and the government consolidated. The result of this act was, unfortunately, to throw the whole secular government into the hands of clerical functionaries. Pius VII. died in 1823, and Consalvi early in the following year.

The qualities of a statesman, which Pius possessed in a very low degree, were altogether wanting in his successor. Cardinal della Genga, who succeeded as Leo XII., was a man of holy life, but his political principles were of an extreme character, and under his patronage the Zelanti were allowed the most dangerous licence. In May 1824, he issued an encyclic epistle against pictism, liberal philosophy, and bible societies; and immediately after reendowed the

¹ *Colonial Church Chronicle*, 1861, p. 425.

² For the recent history of the papacy, see Döllinger, *The Church and the Churches*, translated by M'Cabe, London, 1862; Cardinal Wiseman's *Recollections of the last four Popes*, London, 1858; Ritter, *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, Bonn,

1862, vol. ii.; Gieseler, *Kirchengeschichte der neuesten Zeit*, Bonn, 1855; H. J. Rose, *Church History*, p. 331—353; Karl Matthes, *Allgemeine Kirchliche Chronik*; the *Almanach de Gotha* for various years; and an article in the *Christian Remembrancer* for October 1861.

Jesuits of the Collegium Romanum, who had been recalled by Pius VII. In 1825 he launched an encyclic against freemasons and Carbonari. He concluded a concordat with Holland, and rearranged the churches of Switzerland, Hanover, and the Upper Rhine. He is chiefly remembered, however, as having held the jubilee of 1824-5, as having added several new saints to the calendar, and as having reorganised the church in Brazil.

The reign of Pius VIII., who succeeded in March 1829, witnessed great events—in England the Catholic Emancipation, and in France the Revolution of July. It was, however, too short to give an opportunity for any appreciable exercise of ability, if such existed. Pius issued a bull against freemasonry, raised Thomas Weld, an English gentleman, to the cardinalate, and began the contest with Prussia on the subject of mixed marriages. He died November 30, 1830.

Gregory XVI., who had been known as cardinal Capellari, reigned from 1830 to 1846. The best feature of his reign was the assembly of learned men whom he gathered about him at Rome. Angelo Mai and Mezzofanti enjoyed in their day an unrivalled reputation, the former as a classical editor, the latter as a linguist. The pope was himself a monk, learned and unworldly, entirely unfitted for the government of a state in the condition in which he found Rome. Almost immediately on his accession, his subjects, encouraged by the attitude of France, broke into rebellion: the revolution was, however, easily suppressed by Austria. Upon the outbreak of the insurrection, the great powers assembled at Paris, and on the 31st of May, 1831, recommended, in a famous memorandum, several necessary reforms—principally the admission of the laity into the offices of the government, the restoration of local self-government, and some measure of internal security against the changes incident to an elective sovereignty. The pope and cardinals refused to bind themselves to any fixed reforms, but promised a regulation of the finances, and more publicity in the administration of the government.¹ These reforms were insufficient to content the people. Disturbances broke out afresh, and the Austrians occupied the Legations, and the French Ancona. This occupation lasted until 1838. Rome during this time was a hot-bed of revolution. 'The papal volunteers, drawn from the lowest classes, exercised a gross terrorism; political assassinations, commenced by the revolutionary party, became more frequent.'² The government condescended to persecution, espionage, and the use of foreign mercenaries, and the opposition took up the anarchic republicanism of Mazzini, with all its attendant evils. The actual struggle was, however, reserved for the next reign. Gregory died in 1846. His principal foreign transaction was the quarrel with Prussia on the question of the mixed marriages.

Giovanni Maria, of the counts of Mastai Ferretti, was born at Sinigaglia, May 13, 1792. He studied at Volaterra; undertook a mission in Chili; became president of the Hospital of St. Michael;

¹ Döllinger, 385.

² *Ibid.* 388.

archbishop of Spoleto in 1827 ; bishop of Imola in 1832 ; cardinal in 1840 ; and pope on the 14th of June, 1846,¹ under the name Pius IX. His first political measures were liberal. He began with an amnesty (July 16, 1846), which, unfortunately for himself, opened Rome to the unscrupulous radical exiles. In November he published measures of administrative reform ; in March 1847, he established a new and orderly censorship ; and in April announced a convocation of a constituent body at Rome to consult on the subject of reforms. He soon, however, found that the liberals were only using his measures for their own ends, and himself as a tool, to be cast off as soon as he refused to go their lengths. At the same time he was alienating the only friends on whom he might have reckoned. He was gradually discovering how impossible it was to take a middle path without strength to compel the two extremes, when the French revolution of 1848 broke out. Pius was compelled to grant a constitution to the Roman states, and expel the Jesuits. The revolt of Lombardy followed, and the pope was forced to send his troops against Austria. Matters had now gone too far to admit of temporising. In November, 1848, count Rossi, the pope's wisest adviser, was assassinated by the liberals, and he himself fled to Gaeta in disguise. Rome was declared a republic, and continued such for eight months. On the 3rd of July, 1849, the French entered Rome ; and on the 12th of April, 1850, Pius was brought back under their protection. Since that time he has been maintained in his position by the support of the arms of France.

The spiritual acts of Pius IX. have not shown any of the weakness or vacillation of which his political career has been accused. Equally imprudent and presumptuous, they have been rather marked by a hardy contempt for everything except the exaltation of his see. In an encyclic of November 9, 1846, he imitated his predecessors, Pius VII. and Leo XII., by an attack on the bible societies. A similar letter, dated January 6, 1848, was directed against the eastern church, urging its rulers to accept the Roman supremacy, on the old stock arguments. The patriarchs of Alexandria, Jerusalem, Antioch, and Constantinople, replied in May with a reasonable and sturdy refusal ; and a direct refutation of the arguments of the encyclic followed from the pen of Constantius, archimandrite of Mount Sinai, and ex-patriarch of Constantinople. This reply, by the learning, research, criticism, and argument, that it embodies, fully vindicates the theological ability of the eastern clergy.

On the 29th of September, 1850, the pope, by letters apostolic, introduced a new hierarchy into England, an archbishop of Westminster with twelve suffragans. The effect of this act on England must be considered hereafter : its immediate result to the pope was to exasperate the whole nation against him, and there can be no doubt that he forfeited by it the at least negative support that the papacy had received from this country ever since the French revolution. A

¹ Ritter, ii. 654.

similar measure, superseding the Jansenist succession in Holland, followed on the 4th of March, 1853. Perhaps, however, the most memorable and fatal scandal of this pontificate was the declaration that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin is an article of faith, and that to deny it is heresy. This was done on the 8th of December, 1854, in the presence of 200 bishops and 30,000 people, in the church of St. Peter. The declaration is made in the teeth of Augustine and almost all others of the fathers, and in opposition to all the good sense and learning of the Roman church itself. It may be reasonably doubted, even by a pious Romanist, how far the right of the pope to perform such an act can be admitted, and whether the act, as performed, has a legal validity.¹ Such as it is, however, it is undoubtedly the greatest sin against Christian unity that has been committed since the great breach between Eastern and Western Christendom.

Other acts of Pius IX. are his concordats with Spain, Austria, and Würtemberg, and his canonisation of the martyrs of Japan in 1862.²

§ 14. The state of the Gallican church³ since the restoration has somewhat varied. Under Louis XVIII., notwithstanding the poverty and infidelity with which it had to struggle, it succeeded beyond expectation in the resuscitation of its old institutions. The Society of *Priests of Missions* was revived, and furnished spiritual ministrations to five thousand parishes which were deprived of their pastors. In 1822, the *Union of Lyons* for the extension of the faith was founded as a missionary society for the heathen. The Congregation of Christian Schools, which also had its centre at Lyons, greatly extended its operations, and in 1822 had seventy thousand children under its care. The Jesuits, however, supported by the Ultramontane party, under the viscount de Bonald, Joseph de Maistre, and Lamennais, were sufficiently powerful to prevent any return to Gallican principles: they carried their hatred of these liberties so far that, in 1826, it was thought necessary by sixteen prelates assembled at Paris to protest against their measures. Unhappily, the same party disgraced their return to power by a persecution of the Protestants of Nismes in 1815 and 1819, and by harsh measures against the remnants of the Jansenists and of the constitutional clergy of 1790.

Charles X. was without the liberal tendencies of his brother. Under him the Ultramontane party were supreme, and, without actually benefiting the church in any practical way, made the continuance of the system of the restoration impossible. The reign of Louis-Philippe was a period of depression and struggle against forces temporally too strong for the church. Towards the end of it, a spiritual revival roused the energies of the clergy. Schools, preachings,

¹ It was performed by a dogmatic decree, not by the enactment of a general council.

² The pope has also constituted St. Hilary of Poitiers as one of the doctors of the church, and beatified Peter Claver, John Grande, Paul of the Cross, and Anna

Maria de Paredes. Ritter, ii. 658.

³ For the recent history of the French church, see Ritter, ii. 550, &c.; Gieseler, 63, &c.; Allies, *Journal in France* in 1848, &c. &c.

and public disputations against infidelity were instituted, and some very remarkable converts were made. The champions of the church during this reign were Montalembert, Lacordaire, and Lamennais, the last of whom, a man of great powers, by an attempt to reconcile extreme democratic principles with Ultramontanism, lost the support of his friends, and fell into insignificance.¹ The best men of this party held that the oppressive protection of the old régime was hurtful to the church, and united liberal views with fervent faith and devout religious feeling.

This revival was not smothered by the revolution of 1848, but has since been productive of considerable political effects. There can be no doubt that a vast proportion of the French people are attached to the Roman church, and that the conviction of his need of support from the clergy has compelled the emperor Napoleon III. to maintain the pope at Rome. Their support has been bought also by other means, especially the liberal way in which the cathedrals and other churches through the whole of France have been repaired and furnished. Support thus obtained is precarious; the affections of the priesthood turn, if not in a Legitimist, in an Ultramontane direction. Should the emperor ever feel himself strong enough to dispense with the aid of this party, he will probably cast it off. Some of its most distinguished members—Montalembert, for instance—have been long in disgrace. On the whole, the connexion between religion and the politics of an empire, founded and maintained as that of Louis-Napoleon has been, is greatly to be deprecated.

The ancient spirit of the Gallican church is not, however, extinct. At least one eminent historical writer, abbé Guettée, whose works were condemned by a provincial council at La Rochelle in 1853, still keeps alive the succession of Bossuet.

Among the internal disturbances of the peace of the French church, two deserve to be mentioned. The abbé Chatel, in 1830, attempted to found a *French Catholic* church on rationalist principles, which afterwards developed into Unitarianism. He retained the ceremonial usages of the church, and named himself chief bishop. His church was closed by order of government in 1842.²

Claude Henri de St. Simon, a French nobleman and soldier, began in 1807 to publish his ideas, which were a mixture of pantheism and socialism. He had not much success, and died in 1825. After his death his friends took up the propagation of his tenets, but quarrelled on the subject of community of wives. Their meetings were suppressed by the government in 1832.³

The pretended appearance of the Blessed Virgin to two country children at La Salette, in 1846, also created much scandal throughout Europe. The momentary success of this manœuvre betrayed some of the members of the hierarchy into a premature sanction of the im-

¹ Lamennais, after his political downfall, went into great lengths of religious liberalism, and finally became an infidel.

² Ritter, ii. 632. Gieseler, 94.

³ *Ibid.* 633. Gieseler, 88.

posture; but it was discarded by the archbishop of Lyons, and the pope refused his sanction.

No notice of the French church, however short, can omit the mention of the archbishop Affre of Paris, who fell at the barricades in June 1848, as he was ministering to the wounded. His successor, Sibour, was stabbed by a discontented priest, in the church of St. Etienne du Mont, during divine service, January 3, 1857.

§ 15. The fall of the holy Roman empire belongs to secular history.¹ On the rearrangement of Europe, the ecclesiastical principalities of Germany were not restored, but the cities and territories belonging to them were divided among the secular powers. Prussia received Cologne and Trèves; Würzburg, Augsburg, Bamberg, Eichstadt, and the best part of Mentz fell to Bavaria; the city of Mentz to Hesse Darmstadt; Fulda to Hesse Cassel: Austria and Hanover also rectified their boundaries by the absorption of the dominion of the prelates. Although this arrangement was undoubtedly called for in some measure by the mismanagement of the ecclesiastical princes, which had brought about much of the feeling that made revolution possible in Germany, the inconvenience at the time was very considerable. The districts which were spiritually dependent on these ecclesiastical states generally remained Roman Catholic; but, while in Austria and Bavaria the old hierarchical system was retained, it was necessary that a new one should be devised for the wants of the Roman Catholic countries that remained under the rule of the Protestant families of Prussia, Hanover, Würtemberg, and Baden. To this necessity, and to the complications arising from it, are attributable nearly all the disturbances which have affected the comparatively easy existence of the Roman Catholic church in Germany.

In 1821, by the bull *De Salute Animarum*, pope Pius VIII., with the permission of Prussia, reconstituted the church in North Germany, under an archbishop of Cologne, with suffragans at Trèves, Münster, and Paderborn. These, with the prince-bishop of Breslau, the archbishop of Gnesen-Posen, and the bishops of Ermeland and Culm, constitute the present hierarchy of Prussia. Very soon after this arrangement was perfected, the question of mixed marriages arose.² In the Westphalian and Rhenish provinces, the priests required that on occasion of a marriage between a Protestant and a Roman Catholic, an engagement should be made that the children should be brought up Romanists. This the government resisted. Von Spiegel, archbishop of Cologne, tried to come to a reasonable agreement with the government in 1825, when it was ordered by Frederick William III.³ that the education of the children should be left to the conscience of the parents, and in cases of disagreement, or the death of the parents, the children should be brought up in the religion of the father.

¹ For the history of the Roman church in Germany, see Ritter, ii. 560, &c.; Gieseler, 301.

² On the question of mixed marriages, see Ritter, ii. 638; Gieseler, 348.

³ August 17, 1825.

The priests hereupon refused to take part in the education of any children who were not pledged to them, and refused absolution to persons who had been married by the protestant clergy. In 1828, advice was sought from Rome, but Leo XII. died before deciding; and Pius VIII., in 1830, ordered all mixed marriages which for the future should be celebrated without regard to the decrees of the council of Trent, should be held valid where there was no canonical obstacle, and that the catholic priests should render passive assistance at such marriages; but refusing any further concession. In 1834, Von Spiegel and the chevalier Bunsen came to an agreement that the practice of the eastern provinces, that the children should be brought up in the religion of the father, should be extended to the west, and the bishops of Münster and Paderborn agreed to it. Von Spiegel died in 1835, and his successor, Clement August von Droste Vischering, renewed the contest in an uncompromising spirit. At the same time, a further complication arose from the heterodox teaching of professor Hermes at Bonn, which had been supported by Von Spiegel. Archbishop Clement put forth eighteen theses, to be signed by candidates for holy orders, against these doctrines, and the Prussian government insisted on the withdrawal of the theses. Clement resisted, and the government, unable to see anything conscientious in his behaviour, sent him as a prisoner to Minden, in 1837. This harsh proceeding produced great sympathy for the archbishop. The whole Roman church in Germany took his side, and his fellow archbishop Von Dunin, of Gnesen, was suspended in consequence. In 1841, Frederick William III., the ill-advised author of this proceeding, died; and Frederick William IV., early in his reign, was prevailed on by the mediation of the king of Bavaria to restore peace between church and state, by reinstating the archbishop of Gnesen and liberating the archbishop of Cologne. He also made further concessions to the Roman party, strongly condemning mixed marriages, but prescribing toleration and consideration towards those who had formed them. The archbishop of Cologne now thought it best to retire from the contest; but not before the king had disavowed the violence of his father. He died in 1845. Frederick William IV. showed his good-will to the Roman church, also, by taking a great share in the completion of Cologne cathedral, and by guaranteeing perfect freedom and equality to his Roman Catholic subjects in 1845.

§ 16. Baden and Württemberg were also protestant states containing many Roman Catholics. By the bull of August 16, 1821, Pius VII. erected an archiepiscopal see at Freiburg, with suffragans for Württemberg at Rottenburg, for Nassau at Limburg, for Hesse Darmstadt at Mentz, and for Hesse Cassel at Fulda.

In 1830, an attempt was made by the Baden government to subject ecclesiastical appointments to the veto of the police establishment: a contest ensued upon this which has not yet been settled, although, in 1857 and 1859, concordats with the pope were arranged both in Baden and Württemberg, where a similar struggle had been going on. These concordats have not been approved by the legislature of either

state: that of Baden was abolished in 1860, and that of Würtemberg in 1861.¹

Little need be said of the state of the Roman church in the other German kingdoms. In Hanover, the church is governed by the bishops of Osnabrück and Hildesheim, under a concordat of 1824.

In Austria, the concordat of 1855 gave to the pope greater power in ecclesiastical appointments than he had ever possessed before.² By its provisions the Roman Catholic religion is to be maintained and protected in all rights and prerogatives throughout the empire; the *placet regium* is abolished; free communication with Rome granted to the bishops; all establishments for the instruction of youth, public and private, are intrusted to the bishops; all questions of law, connected with the faith, sacraments, and ecclesiastical functions, are referred to ecclesiastical courts; and matrimonial causes, in all respects, except the civil effects of marriage, are to be decided on the principles of church law and the prescriptions of the council of Trent. It is hardly needful to say that the announcement of this agreement was received with the utmost astonishment throughout Europe.

The events of the year 1859 worked a change in Austria, in religious as well as in other respects. Immediately after the conclusion of the war with Sardinia, the emperor began to take measures for ameliorating the condition of the protestants in his dominions. These measures, which, unfortunately, have not been received by the protestants in a conciliatory spirit, were completed, in 1861, by the imperial patent of April 8, in which it is decreed that the protestants of the recognised sects shall enjoy the same rights, civil and political, as the catholics, in all the countries of the crown, except Hungary and Venetia.³ The more bigoted Romanist districts immediately petitioned against this; the diet of the Tyrol demanded that the patent should not be executed in that province. But this demand was rejected by the emperor, by the advice of his minister, Von Schmerling, whose efforts, with those of the more liberal Romanists, are now directed to a relaxation of the terms of the concordat of 1855.

§ 17. The internal history of the German-Roman church partakes of the characteristics that are to be found in the other churches of the same communion. It was infected with liberalism during the prevalence of French ideas under the influence of Napoleon. These especially found utterance in South Germany, where Werkmeister, a priest in Stuttgart, is mentioned as the propounder of the liberal theories of church government; and Weissenberg, vicar of the diocese of Constance, as introducing practical improvements in the administration of his office, which marked him out for persecution at Rome. These indications of a free-thinking temper soon died out, and were succeeded by a strong ultramontane reaction, immediately after the war of liberation ended. The miracles of prince Alexander of Hohen-

¹ See Dr. Ferdinand Piper's *Annalen der Jahre 1859 und 1860*, p. 134.

² *Almanach de Gotha*, 1857. *Chronique*, le 18 Août 1855

³ *Almanach de Gotha*, 1862. *Chronique*, p. 42. *Allgemeine kirchliche Chronik*, 1861, p. 142.

lohe, in 1821, were appealed to as proving the divine authority of the Roman see. These are now almost forgotten, or only appealed to as parallels to the wonders of mesmerism.¹

Some workings of liberalism showed themselves also in Silesia, in 1826; and a movement against clerical celibacy in Baden, in 1832, attained such proportions as to draw a damnatory bull from pope Gregory XVI. By the same means, the rationalist teaching of Hermes, at Bonn, was stifled in 1835.²

A more decided and systematic tendency to mysticism appeared in Bavaria early in the century, the leaders of which were men famous in their day: M. Johann Michael Sailer, Martin Boos (d. 1825), Ignaz Lindl, Johann Goszner, and Thomas Pöschl. Goszner and Lindl ended by becoming Protestants. In 1830, a great part of the population of the Zillerthal left the Roman church, and were in consequence compelled to emigrate to Prussia.³

The latest, and apparently most dangerous, demonstration against Rome, was that of Ronge and the German Catholic church, which took its rise in 1844.⁴ On the 18th of August that year, bishop Arnoldi, of Treves, exhibited to a devout multitude the famous relic of the holy coat, the seamless robe of our Saviour. A visit to Treves for the purpose of seeing it, or of contributing to the repairs of the cathedral, merited plenary absolution. The liberal press called attention to this in a persecuting spirit, but the chief spokesman of the reforming party in the church was *John Ronge*, a Silesian priest, who loudly demanded the punishment of the bishop. Ronge was born in 1813, in Silesia; in 1841 became chaplain at Grottkau; and in 1842 he was suspended in consequence of a violent letter against the pope, which appeared in a Saxon newspaper. This attack on Arnoldi produced a great sensation, and Ronge, on the spur of his popularity, became a great reformer. He founded a community to be called the German Catholic church, held a general council at Leipzig in 1845, at which himself and another apostate priest named Czerski were present, and carried away a great number of converts. His success, apparently, was too much for him. He began to show a tendency to democratic principles, which alarmed the protestant populations, and alienated the favourable inclination of the German governments. He fell as quickly as he rose. Czerski and his Silesian partisans deserted him, and he himself was obliged to leave Prussia. In 1861, he was assisting the German revolutionists in London, and, on the accession of William I., returned to his country under the protection of the amnesty.⁵

A reformation on primitive principles has also been propounded by Hirscher, dean of Freiburg in Brisgau, an enlightened and learned Roman Catholic; from which, had it met with anything like a general acceptance, much might have been hoped for the German church. Hirscher was, however, compelled to withdraw his book, *The present*

¹ Gieseler, 321, 336.

² *Ibid.* 328, 350. *Christian Remembrancer*, Jan. 1845.

³ Gieseler, 338.

⁴ Gieseler, 330. Ritter, ii. 644, 645.

⁵ *Allgemeine kirchl. Chron.* 1861, p. 119.

State of the Church,¹ under the threat of deprivation, and has sunk into the normal silence to which all reforming efforts are condemned by the Roman church.

§ 18. The Roman Catholic church in Switzerland,² up to the time of the revolution, was under the several jurisdictions of Constance, Mentz, Besançon, and Milan. After the break-up and rearrangement of Europe, Pius VII. governed by means of a vicar apostolic, but this system proving unsatisfactory to the country generally, which was unfavourable to ultramontanisin, and remembered its early independence under the German bishops, was set aside in 1845. By a concordat effected in that year, five bishoprics were instituted, Basel, Geneva, Sion, Chur, and St. Gall. The Italians of the canton of Tessin remained in the province of Milan, and diocese of Como, until 1860 or 1861. The apostolic nuncio at Lucern acts as metropolitan.

The restoration of the aristocratic party to their predominant position by the constitution of 1815, and the absence of any strong central state power under that system, gave to the Roman Catholic church an opening which promised great things. Partly, however, by the spread of liberal ideas, and partly by the stubborn and aggressive character of the ultramontane policy, this vantage-ground was lost: the aristocratic party, not wishing to lose the national character of the church, was alienated by a dislike of the Jesuits, and, in 1830, the new constitution threw the supreme influence into democratic hands. To meet this, the church party organised itself more closely, the different monastic establishments were brought into a union, and a reaction set in, which was considerably aided by the panic of Zurich, in 1839, caused by the appointment of Strauss as professor in the university. The measures taken for defence were not premature. In 1841, the government of the canton of Aargau, contrary to the express guarantee of the constitution, attempted to dissolve the monasteries of that canton, but was frustrated by the federal government. A revolution in the canton of Wallis followed in 1844, in which the catholic party triumphed. The same year, the Jesuits were invited to Lucern. The liberals now mustered in force against the Jesuit party, and marched upon Lucern. The attack, however, miscarried for want of organisation, and the Jesuits triumphed. The catholic cantons then formed themselves into a separate confederation—the Sonderbund. War followed in 1847, and the liberals were victorious. Forty convents were suppressed, and the bishop of Lausanne imprisoned. Since that time another recoil has taken place in favour of the catholics, whose chief help has been derived from the internal weakness and division of the Protestant party. In 1859, a Roman Catholic church was consecrated in Geneva, where, up to 1793, it was death to say mass.

§ 19. The kingdom of the Netherlands,³ as established in 1814, was an experiment made by the great powers of Europe, to try whether

¹ Translated and published at Oxford, in 1852, under the title *The Sympathies of the Continent*.

² On this subject see Gieseler, p. 167.

³ *Ibid.* 174.

two nations, differing in religion, in historical traditions, and industrial occupations, could be united by a common interest, as against a common enemy, and by the opportunities such a union would afford them of mutually supplementing each other's wants. Holland was republican, mercantile, Calvinist; Belgium was monarchical, agricultural, and more papal than the papacy. As early as 1816, a strong Roman Catholic feeling against the house of Orange showed itself: the fanaticism of the clergy, under prince de Broglie, bishop of Ghent, went so far, that they refused to pray for the royal family, in spite even of the advice of cardinal Consalvi, and an admonitory letter from Pius VII. himself. The Jesuits brought their whole art to bear upon the people, through the *Société Catholique*, and, by their influence, skill, and industry in educating the young, made much way. The government in vain tried the usual arms of petty persecution. The prince de Broglie had to go into exile; in 1823, the *Société Catholique* was suspended; and, in 1825, the schools of the Jesuits and the smaller seminaries were closed. In order to counteract the training of the bishops' seminaries, a philosophic college was founded the same year at Louvain, and a course of a year's study in it was made imperative on all pupils who wished to enter the seminaries. The clergy stoutly resisted this, and the bishops refused to take into the seminaries any pupils of the philosophical college. In 1827, the point was yielded by the government, and, two years after, the philosophic college was closed.

The revolution of 1830 created the new kingdom of Belgium. It was brought about by a union of the extreme Roman Catholic with the extreme radical party. All the advantages fell to the share of the former. By the constitution, freedom of worship was secured to all religions, but the church was declared independent of the state. In 1834, two universities were founded by private societies, a so-called catholic one at Louvain, and a free one at Brussels. The state also endowed two untheological universities at Ghent and Liege.

The new kingdom has hitherto served as a proof that Romanism is not incompatible with liberal institutions. Without prejudging the question, we must remember that the unbounded influence of the priesthood over the great majority of the population keeps the electoral suffrage very much under their guidance. The great statesman-like qualities of king Leopold must also be taken into consideration. All things being weighed, however, Romanism appears in its best colours in this well-governed little state.

§ 20. In dark contrast with this stand Spain and Portugal.¹

Ferdinand VII., on his restoration to the throne of Spain in 1814, attempted by despotic measures to undo the reforms which had been introduced by king Joseph and by the central junta of Cadiz. Without delay he restored the monasteries which those powers had dissolved, recalled the Jesuits, and reestablished the inquisition. These measures, in conjunction with political acts of the same complexion,

¹ Ritter, ii. 646, 649. Gieseler, 121.

produced the insurrection of 1820. Ferdinand was compelled to accept a constitution, to abolish the inquisition and the monasteries, and to banish his clerical advisers. The clergy were at the same time subjected to the jurisdiction of the civil courts, the Jesuits expelled, diplomatic relations broken off with Rome, and a project ventilated by which the Spanish church would have been formed into an independent patriarchate. The intervention of France again changed the face of affairs. In 1823, the ecclesiastical novelties were set aside. Some concessions, however, made to the reforming spirit of the nation, provoked a reaction under Don Carlos, the king's brother and presumptive successor, in favour of absolutism. To meet this, Ferdinand, who had contracted an incestuous marriage with his niece, Christina of Naples, abolished the Salic law, and declared his daughter Isabella his successor. By these acts the sympathies of the constitutional party were drawn to the side of the king, and he himself advanced so far in a liberal direction as to appropriate twenty million francs of church funds to state purposes. On his death, broke out the war between the Carlists and Christinos, as the supporters of queen Isabella were called. Extreme measures against the church were enacted by the liberals. In 1834, the monks were accused of producing cholera at Madrid by poisoning the wells. Several monasteries were sacked in consequence, and their inmates murdered. In July, the inquisition was again abolished, the Jesuits banished, and nine hundred monasteries dissolved; and this measure was quickly followed by a general one. In 1836, a sweeping measure of suspension was enforced against the priests who were suspected of Carlist inclinations. In 1837, tithes were abolished, and church property confiscated. The pope in vain endeavoured, by protests and allocutions, to annul these acts of tyranny, but the Cortes persisted. In 1840, queen Christina was obliged to resign the regency, and under Espartero, her successor, the connexion with Rome was broken off. This state of things continued until the end of Espartero's regency, in 1844. The queen, now become her own mistress, soon evinced a desire for a return to the traditional policy of her predecessors. In 1848, the papal nuncio resumed his place at Madrid. A concordat was effected in 1851, but this was again infringed on the restoration of Espartero to power in 1854. Since the year 1856, when general O'Donnell took the lead in the government, a series of measures favourable to the church has succeeded the long oppression. In 1858, the restoration of the church property, or rather of such portions of it as remained unsold, was proposed to the Cortes. On the 25th of August, 1859, a convention was arranged between the queen and the pope, by which the Spanish government undertakes to maintain the concordat of 1851, and to suffer no more alienation of the property of the clergy without leave from the holy see.

In Portugal, on a smaller scale, the same events have been enacted. There the constitution was introduced, in 1820, by Don Pedro, who immediately resigned the crown to his daughter, Maria da Gloria, under the regency of his brother, Don Miguel. Miguel,

in 1828, abolished the constitution, and declared himself king. A wretched state of terrorism and confusion ensued. Don Pedro returned from Brazil, deposed his brother, and himself undertook the regency. His measures were in a liberal direction. In 1833, he dissolved most of the monasteries, and confiscated the monastic and ecclesiastical property. He died in 1834, but diplomatic relations with Rome were not resumed until 1841. The reaction which has taken place in Spain does not appear to have reached Portugal. A concordat was indeed established on the accession of Pedro V., but without more than mere formal results.

In both Spain and Portugal, it is believed that, under the uniform intolerant exterior of Romanism, there is a strong current of unbelief. Acts of the most extreme hostility to the church have been done under the guise of orthodoxy. The utmost intolerance reigns everywhere; but this, it is unnecessary to say, may exist without a spark of living belief. Where the opposition to the clergy extends also to the denial of their creed, no tendency towards protestant principles is evinced: it is solely towards infidelity. The tolerant spirit of the Portuguese government may be estimated by the measures enforced against the French sisters of mercy, who, having been invited, in 1857 and 1858, to alleviate the sufferings of the people during the cholera, were expelled in 1861 on the charge of propagating, by means of schools, opinions tending towards the renovation of monasticism and absolute government.¹

Of the state of Italy² it would be almost premature to speak. Wherever the Piedmontese have prevailed, they have carried out extreme measures against the church. In 1850, Victor Emmanuel abolished ecclesiastical jurisdictions in his dominions, abrogated tithes and the right of asylum, and banished the archbishop of Turin for protesting against the confiscation. In 1855, he also suppressed the monasteries of his kingdom. The same principles have been carried out in the provinces which have fallen into his hands since the war of 1859: the concordats have been annulled, and the monasteries suppressed. It remains to be seen whether this is a prelude to the breaking up of superstition and ignorance, or whether it is to end, as it has done elsewhere, merely in rapacious infidelity. While we write, Victor Emmanuel has prevailed on the blood of St. Januarius to liquefy by the bribe of a diamond necklace. *Non tali auxilio.*

Whether, amidst the shock of revolutionary change, during which the most ordinary rules of morality have, as it would seem, by common consent been suspended, there will be openings made for the purification of the Roman church from the evils of a long and pernicious temporal prosperity, remains in the hands of God. Zealous

¹ It would be a useless task to attempt to give in detail the separate church histories of the South American States. They are, however, in different degrees of completeness, much the same as those of the mother-countries. The great struggle now going

on in Mexico is principally caused by a sweeping measure of confiscation of church property, which is the sole point of attraction for European sympathies, for or against.

² Gieseler, 135. Ritter, ii. 654, &c.

men in Europe and America are trying to spread the knowledge of the gospel in its simplicity in the lands where it has been so long obscured. Whether or no they will succeed must be the problem of the next age; but, in either event, it is most desirable that their measures should be taken in such a way as neither to produce unnecessary bitterness, nor to disparage the truths they are promulgating by any connexion with intolerant prejudiced proselytism—a fault to be found quite as often on the liberal side as on the other. Happily these efforts are not unrecognised by the better Italians; and it is not merely the existing vices and faults of the papal system, but the knowledge of better things existing in the reformed churches, that are urging them to a change. A Neapolitan society, consisting entirely of priests, has been founded, in this view, on the basis of—1. Knowledge and free reading of the Scriptures; 2. Vernacular liturgy; 3. The election of bishops by clergy and laity; 4. The abolition of the compulsory celibacy of the clergy. Among the most honoured supporters of this scheme of reform may be mentioned Lorenzo Zaccaro, Tiboni, Perfetti, and count Ottavio Tasca.

Besides this direction of Italian aspirations, a strong party, which may be represented by Passaglia, combines the desire of great political and ecclesiastical reforms with staunch maintenance of the ultramontane peculiarities of doctrine.

§ 21. The vicissitudes which the Protestant churches of Germany have experienced during the last century have been not fewer nor less vitally important than those which have befallen the church of Rome. It is, however, in a very different direction that we have to look for them: with very few exceptions, they have proceeded rather from internal than external causes. It will be necessary, for ever so brief a view of them, to recur to the period at which Mosheim wrote. He has traced, in the later chapters of this work, the origin of much that has since his time developed into history. But the date of his death may stand for a great epoch of transition in the religious history of Germany. The authority of the symbolical books had been shaken chiefly by the negative tendencies of the pietistic school. A dry secular spirit had possessed the great body of the clergy ever since the end of the thirty years' war; and a secularised clergy could do little to stem the tide of moral and social corruption diffused from the petty courts of the empire. Pietism also was effete, although it still could boast the great names of Bengel, Crusius, and Oettinger. With the majority, it had become but a tradition, and retained only those properties of dissolution and separativeness which could be traced in its early developments. It was jealous of the metaphysical philosophy, but with only vitality enough to persecute. Whilst it was dissolving the outer bonds of communion, discontent with the symbolic books was spreading in the better educated circles of society. There was, indeed, an inconsistency in a church which, claiming to hold by Scripture as the only rule of faith, would suffer no departure from old and dry formulas. The confessions that

told of living truths in the mouth of their compilers, had no voice whatever in the secularised and paralysed church of the eighteenth century. The study of theology was extinct, except among the pietists and the incipient rationalists, whose theology was not that of Luther or Melancthon. Nor were the foreign influences to which the German mind was exposed more favourable to religious thought. Without any classical literature of their own, the Germans were still a thoughtful people. English deism, with its thoughtful, serious religiousness, had a charm for the literary circles; and French infidelity hardly needed its garb of wit and frivolity to suit well the moral character of the courts. Ancient scholarship still flourished, and could boast of great names in Greek and Roman learning; but the application of the historical and critical methods which had been so successful in the case of the writers of heathen antiquity, was looked upon by the church with an apprehension which soon gave reality to the phantoms that it had conjured up. The study of church history, and the critical study of the Bible, were thus taken up only by inferior scholars; and, more than that, by men who came to the work with a bias against the truth of the one and the authority of the other. The tendency of thought in Mosheim himself is sufficiently apparent; but in him it was restrained by a devout mind and a firm adhesion to the Lutheran confession. But the historical school that succeeded him, of which Semler (1725–1791) is generally spoken of as the representative, was thoroughly rationalist. He adopted and popularised the principle of accommodation, according to which everything in Holy Scripture that is at variance with the views of the present age is interpreted as an adaptation to the prejudices of the people to whom the words in question were spoken. Side by side with the historical school was the critical school founded by Ernesti, who endeavoured to elicit the meaning of the Holy Scripture by the methods used in the interpretation and criticism of heathen writers—a principle which, however useful it may be under limitations, and with the correction of creeds and ecclesiastical tradition, was, as a matter of fact, very soon carried to the length of denying any divine authority at all to the books of the Bible. Ernesti's principles were carried to an extreme by *Michaelis*.¹

§ 22. Philosophy was preparing to fill the place vacated by Christian theology. The principles and method of Wolf are termed by the greatest living writer on philosophy a theological dogmatism; but the expression must be understood to mean something different from the old dogmatic system of the Lutheran church. It was, in fact, the parent of rationalism. The natural development of a system which places human reason on an equality with divine reve-

¹ On the later history of German protestantism, see *German Protestantism*, by E. H. Dewar, Oxford, 1844. *Internal History of German Protestantism*, by C. F. A. Kahnis; translated by Meyer: Edinburgh, 1856. Ritter, ii. 575. Gieseler, 179. Rose,

Ch. History, p. 411, &c. Döllinger, *The Church and the Churches*, 267. Something may also be learned from *The Life of Frederick Perthes*, by C. T. Perthes, Edinburgh, 1856; and a little from the life and letters of Schleiermacher.

lation, as an instrument of discovering religious truth, will be found to be this: beginning with an attempt to prove every doctrine of the faith by human reason,¹ it proceeds to a stage at which it admits only those articles of belief which are demonstrable by reason, and thence to a point at which human reason is made the sole authority, and divine revelation altogether cast aside. The first of these phases represents the theological dogmatism of Wolf.

His metaphysical philosophy was the lineal descendant of the Cartesian. Clearness is the measure of truth. *Cogito, ergo sum*; and, consequently, I have an idea of God: therefore there is a God. Wolf's demonstrative method is also derived from Des Cartes: starting from the clear ideas that were innate in the natural reason, he deduced from them, by a mathematical process, every doctrine of the faith. The pietists took alarm at this; Wolf was expelled from Halle, but not before he had founded a philosophy which, in combination with the critical and historical schools of exegesis, was soon far to outrun him. *Canz*, *Carpov*, and *Darjes* proved the necessity of the *Trinity* with mathematical certainty. The popular philosophers who even before Wolf's death had inherited his fame, only substituted for his demonstrative method the criterion of *sound common sense*. They accepted as true only what was clear to it. The chief names among them are Reimarus, Moses Mendelssohn, Garve, Sulzer, Platner, and Nicolai:² they were deists. From Wolf's demonstration, that man by nature knows of God, *Töllner* developed a doctrine that this natural light is sufficient for salvation. The application of this to the inspiration of Scripture brought out the belief that it is only in a way impossible for us to determine that any action of God on the inspired writers can be said to have taken place: He has neither inwardly nor outwardly dictated the sacred books.³ Philosophy, however, did not stop short with Des Cartes. *Cogito, ergo sum*, developed in Spinoza into pantheism, and in Berkeley into idealism. The innate ideas of Leibnitz were the basis of the teaching of Wolf; but the system of Emmanuel Kant was the parent of the modern philosophy and the guide of modern rationalism. Kant, in his *Critic of the Pure Reason*, proves that the existence of God is not demonstrable by human reason. But, in his *Religion within the limits of Practical Reason*, he proves that the existence of God is a postulate of the practical reason, a fact of subjective consciousness, not demonstrable, but indispensable. On this basis he

¹ What is the *human reason* that rationalism makes the judge of truth? With the German vulgar rationalists it was simply common sense. More strictly speaking, it is the sum of the convictions of the age, therefore a variable quantity. Hence its constant internal divisions. 'In a word, rationalism rejects a divine revelation as the basis of religious certitude, and then can never raise itself beyond the cavils and contentions of mere individual opinion.'

Morell, p. 320. Kahnis, p. 169—171.

² Kahnis, *Internal History of Protestantism*, p. 29.

³ Töllner, Reinhard, Storr, Doederlein, agree in restricting inspiration to this, that 'the sacred authors were so far under the special influence of the Holy Ghost, that the matter of their writings was suggested to them, and on points of doctrine they were preserved from error.' Dewar, p. 103.

constructs a system of morality, and, to support and strengthen his moral system, allows the introduction of religion and the belief in a future state. The main force of Kant's method, as exhibited by himself, is negative, and tends towards scepticism.¹ What little there is of positive or affirmative principle was developed by *Jacobi* into a system in which a divine faculty of faith is supposed to take cognisance of spiritual things in the same way that sense does of material objects.

Under Kant's system, theology and philosophy parted company. Fichte, his successor in the throne of philosophy, maintained a subjective idealism. Ideas are the only knowledge: ideas are not impressed from without, but originated from within: the Ego creates the Non Ego; being and thought are identical, object and subject are one. Schelling, by a combination of Spinoza's pantheism with Fichte's principle of the oneness of subject and object, maintained that the real Ego, subject or creator of the Non Ego, is the *absolute* or *infinite*: it is the universal nature which in us is conscious of itself. 'Men are but the innumerable eyes with which the infinite world-spirit beholds itself.'² Hegel follows with a new revelation. The secret of existence is in neither the Ego nor the Non Ego, neither in subject nor object, but in *the relation* of the two. *Idealism* becomes *absolute*. History, religion, philosophy are but contemplations of the self-development of the *absolute*. It would be quite beside our subject to go into the unintelligible minutiae of these systems: unhappily, each in its turn left its impress on the character of religion in Germany.³ Fichte, whose God was merely a moral order of the universe, was, indeed, cried out against as an atheist: but Hegel, whose system was apparently a constructive one, and whose turn of mind was conservative and dogmatic, was at one period of his career held up as the bulwark of orthodoxy in church and state;⁴ and when the destructive tendency of his principles was discovered, Schelling was brought to Berlin to administer a corrective to the philosophic minds there. But Schelling had by this time outgrown his ancient tenets, and his lectures exhibited a gnostic or theosophistic appearance, which has put the final touch to the suicidal absurdities on which have been wasted some of the brightest, acutest, most laborious, and ingenuous minds that ever existed.⁵

§ 23. Notwithstanding the paralysis of religion in the church, the inroads of illuminism and philosophy, and the practical infidelity which, under the guise of humanism and utilitarian philanthropy,⁶

¹ Morell, *Philosophy of Religion*, p. 314, London, 1849.

² Lewes, *Biographical History of Philosophy*, iv. 209.

³ Morell's *Philosophy of Religion*, p. 92. 'Fichte, following in the footsteps of Kant, refers religion to a faith in the moral order of the universe. Schelling took up the thread of speculation where Spinoza had left it, and elaborated that idea of religion which makes it spring from an immediate

intuition of the union of the finite with the infinite, God becoming self-conscious in human history. This led the way for the speculations of Hegel, who supposes religion in its proper intensity to consist in the process by which we think ourselves up logically and consecutively into the region of the universal.'

⁴ *Aids to Faith*, 150, 151.

⁵ *Ibid.* 161.

⁶ By humanism are to be understood the

prevailed in the principal protestant court of Germany, the symbolical books stood their ground for a time. They were indeed attacked, in common with Holy Scripture, by Edelmann (1698-1767), a man of bad character and pantheistic principles, and by Dippel (1673-1734), under the name of Christianus Democritus, who, beginning with pietism, ended in being a Gnostic; but these were mere adventurers. The real attack began in 1774, and the whole of the protestant church in Germany, by 1787, was become rationalistic. In the former year, Lessing, the most eminent literary man in Germany, began to publish what he called the *Wolfenbüttel Fragments*, written by Reimarus, a professor at Hamburg, who had died six years before. These *Fragments* impugned the historical character of the Holy Scriptures. Our Lord is represented as a politico-religious faction leader, and a universal system of rational religion is propounded.

Lessing himself, without allowing that he agreed with the doctrine of the *Fragments*, professed to be desirous of rational and free handling of religious questions. In his play of *Nathan the Wise*, he propounded the doctrine of the equality of Christianity, Judaism, and Mahometanism; they are equally true and equally false; Holy Scripture furnishes us with illustrations, not foundations, of knowledge. In a work on the education of the human race, he professed to trace the history of mankind in its several developments, as educating the religious faculty of man, but bringing out of him in succession only what was in him already; whilst revelation is indeed useful, but only as bringing out light and knowledge earlier than it could otherwise have come.

The success of the *Wolfenbüttel Fragments*, and the influence of Lessing in Germany, were so great, that, in the year 1788, an attempt was made by the king of Prussia to restrain it by an edict. 'It has been remarked with grief,' he says, 'that so many clergymen have the boldness to disseminate the doctrine of Socinians, deists, and naturalists, under the name of illuminism.' They are forbidden, under pain of deposition, to continue to do so. The thunderbolt, however, fell harmless, and illuminism continued to work its way under these principles, until it was in a measure superseded by the popularity of the Kantian philosophy, with which the reign of rationalism, in its restricted meaning, began. The importance which Kant's doctrine of the practical reason gave to morality was the easiest point for popular preaching to lay hold on, and the whole preaching of the clergy was confined to morality. In 1794,

principles, as they were called, the aim of which was the natural development of all man's powers and faculties, merely as man the animal, without regard to the spiritual life, which, in fact, it ignored. To it belonged the *philanthropic schools* of Germany, of which Basedow was the representative and founder. From this humanism arose the exclusively utilitarian institutions and modes of thought so characteristic of the latter part of the eighteenth century. At the

same time the literature of Germany, such as it was, was ludicrously sentimental and romantic. Yet better elements were not wanting, as, for example, in Hamann, Lavater, Claudius, and others. To the curious state of things broken up by the revolution, must be referred the prominence of the Illuminati and the freemasons, whose vagaries, however, do not much concern church history.

Frederick William II. issued another edict, commanding the clergy to abstain from mere moralising, and to maintain the authority of the symbolical books. This, like the preceding edict, failed. The great teachers of the rationalistic school were, in exegesis, Paulus (1762-1851), who explained away the miracles as natural occurrences, prophecies as mere wise sayings, orthodoxy as upright conduct in inquiring after truth; in systematic theology, or *dogmatic*, Wegscheider, Eckermann, and Bretschneider; and in practical theology, Röhr. The defence of orthodoxy was but weakly conducted, against Lessing's illuminism, by Göze, Scherzer, and G. Schlegel; and against rationalism by Flatt and a few others.

§ 24. The earlier years of the nineteenth century witnessed the almost unrestrained sway of rationalism.¹ The evidences of Christianity, the inspiration of the canonical books, the possibility of the leading events recorded in Holy Scripture, the facts of our Saviour's life, any divine origin of religion at all, were summarily rejected. Opposed to it was what is called supernaturalism, the doctrine that not human reason but Holy Scripture is the rule of religious truth. But this supernaturalism was a very different thing from the old faith, and the Scripture which it recognised was the Bible toned down by rationalistic criticism to the level of the opinion of the day. The great representatives of supernaturalism were Reinhard and Storr.² The same period was the epoch of the greatest depression in German politics. With the war of liberation a more hopeful era began, marked by greater earnestness, deeper search for truth, and a higher morality. The genius of the apparent restoration of belief was *Schleiermacher*. The question, How is it that the mind of man becomes conscious of God? had been variously answered by the philosophers. Kant had ascribed the origin of this knowledge to a fundamental law of the moral reason, but the knowledge so acquired was but of a subjective truth, and the God so revealed was but a hypothetical basis for morality. Fichte had declared the instrument of knowledge to be faith, but his God was merely the moral harmony of the world, and faith was equivalent, in his vocabulary, to will. Schelling's intellectual intuition revealed no personal God, and could not be made a basis for practical religion. Hegel ascribed the agency to thought, but the absolute ceased to be absolute under the condition of being thought about. Jacobi imagined a special organ of the soul to take immediate cognisance of the Divine. 'According to Schleiermacher,³ the essence of religion is to be found in a feeling of absolute

¹ One of the effects of rationalism was of course to drive those whose minds it could not satisfy either into Romanism or a dangerous mysticism. Among the more eminent converts to the former were count Frederick of Stolberg in 1800, Frederick von Schlegel, and F. L. Z. Werner in 1811, and Hurter in 1844. Among the mystics, Madame von Krüdeners is the best known name. Pietistic principles also still retained a footing in

South Germany; and some success attended the labours of English Baptists and Swedenborgians.

² Gieseler opposes Rationalism and Supernaturalism as contraries; Naturalism and Supernaturalism, as also Rationalism and Positivism, as contradictories (p. 201). Bretschneider and others were Rational Supernaturalists.

³ 'Schleiermacher possessed advantages and qualifications rarely enjoyed even by the

and entire dependence, in which the mutual action and reaction of subject and object upon each other, which constitutes the ordinary consciousness of mankind, gives way to a sense of utter passive helplessness—to a consciousness that our entire personal agency is annihilated in the presence of the infinite energy of the Godhead.' It was, in fact, a religion of feeling only. So far as it recognised the importance of this element in man's nature, which had been overlooked by the rationalists, it was a step in advance; but it failed to see that this feeling of dependence could no more originate the knowledge of God than the Kantian doctrine of the moral reason. It is no wonder, then, that Schleiermacher was a pantheist, or that, in his critical character, he went further in a rationalist direction than most of the rationalists properly so called. Retaining the semblance of the Gospel history, he maintained 'that the resurrection and the last judgment are to be understood not as positive truths, but as the outward representations of general truths.'¹ They were to him, in fact, fables clothing in an impossible form some indisputable truth of morality. 'Doctrinal belief, in its material part, depends on the attempt to exhibit in doctrine the emotions of the Christlike character.'² The system of Schleiermacher was dominant in Prussia from the year 1813.³

25. One of the first questions which required attention after the peace of 1815 was church organisation. This had, since the reformation, been in a very anomalous condition. In several states, as in Saxony, the princes were Roman Catholic and the subjects Protestant; in others, as in Prussia, the princes were Reformed and the subjects Lutheran. Different notions of ecclesiastical constitution prevailed. The old theory, which was most general, was that the princes had succeeded to the jurisdiction of the ancient bishops, and ought to

most favoured for penetrating into the grounds of Christian theology. His early education among the Moravians had imbued his mind with that deep tone of fervent piety which so strikingly characterised it, especially at the two extremes of his life: on the other hand, his devotion to literature and vast attainments in philosophy placed him in the very highest position for testing the claims of historical criticism and metaphysical analysis. He was conscious, on the one hand, that the deep inward piety in which his own life had been nurtured, could in no sense be based upon speculative or rationalistic grounds. Its whole complexion he saw to be entirely distinct from mere reason, borrowing from it neither its light nor its certitude, and springing up in the bosom of the holy quite irrespective of any logical proofs by which its validity could be urged. On the other hand, he saw with equal distinctness that theology could not be a mere impartation from heaven; that, in fact, it is purely human in its form; and that it necessarily involves a portion of

human imperfection. In this way three things became abundantly evident: first, that the religious life is a fact in human nature, in no sense evolved from any kind of speculative reasoning; secondly, that, notwithstanding this, it is a fact the evidence of whose validity must be centred not in the letter of a book, but in the depths of human experience; and thirdly, that theology is the product of two factors, being evolved out of the living consciousness of the pious by the attempt of their reflective understanding to render an account of their inward spiritual life. The paradoxes before involved in the controversy thus became merged into a higher unity.' Morell, p. 393, 394. This is the description of a disciple.

¹ Gieseler, 240. *Aids to Faith*, 149.

² Ritter, ii. 585.

³ De Wette and Hase were two of the chief theologians of the incipient renovation. They were not strictly rationalists, but combined the systems of Jacobi and Schleiermacher with the maintenance of reason as the supreme arbiter of truth.

retain an outline of the diocesan system in the administration. This system was called the *episcopal system*, and the administration was by means of ecclesiastical courts or consistories. It prevailed generally in the Lutheran countries. A second theory, which was first developed by Grotius, was the *territorial system*, in which the prince is supreme head of church and state, and the church administration a mere department in the public service. A third system, which was maintained by Pfaff of Tübingen and Mosheim, was the *collegial system*, which recognised the church and state as co-ordinate, giving to the state *jura circa sacra*, and retaining to the church *jura in sacra*. The ecclesiastical share in this system was administered by synods. It prevailed generally in the Calvinist churches out of Germany.

The first attempt at a restoration of ecclesiastical order proceeded from the king of Prussia, Frederick William III. He, with the assistance of Schleiermacher, bishop Neander, Eylert, and others, accomplished in 1817 a union of the Lutheran and Calvinist churches in Prussia.¹ According to his intention, this union was to be not doctrinal, but ritual; and, to insure this aim, a liturgy, which had been drawn up by the king himself in 1816, and introduced into the royal chapels, was promulgated with additions, in 1821, for the use of the United Evangelical church. The union was speedily imitated in Hesse Cassel and Rhenish Bavaria in 1818, in Anhalt Bernburg in 1820, in Waldeck and Baden in 1821, in Hesse Darmstadt in 1822, and in Anhalt Dessau in 1827.

But the liturgy quickly excited opposition. This arose in some measure from the feeling of the rationalists that it was an infringement of the liberty of religious thought, but principally from the stricter Lutherans, especially the high Lutheran school of Silesia, under Scheibel and Steffens. The rationalists, however, contented themselves with a speculative opposition, and the wrath of the government fell upon the Lutherans of Silesia. They were treated as dangerous sectaries, and thousands of them compelled to emigrate to America. Their preachers were imprisoned until the accession of Frederick William IV. in 1841. As soon as they were released, they formed themselves into a separate Lutheran church, and were recognised by the government as a sectarian body. By several distinct measures, the new liturgy was forced on the body of the clergy.

In Baden, the Prussian liturgy was introduced into the grand-ducal chapels in 1830, but rejected by the clergy, who claimed the right of initiating such a measure for the general synod. A new form, drawn up at home, and a national catechism, were adopted by that body in 1834.

¹ The idea of this union had been formed by Frederick William as early as 1808, and developed during his visit to England in 1814. Bunsen, *Signs of the Times*, p. 359, 360, quoted by Rose, *Ch. Hist.* p. 420. It is curious to compare with this the attempt of archbishop Sharp and Jablonski to introduce the English liturgy into Hanover

and Prussia in the 18th century. See Anderson's *History of the Colonial Church*, and Newcome's *Life of Archbishop Sharp*. Frederick William also, in 1816, named certain of his clergy bishops, and Borowski, in 1829, an archbishop, and the former title was also given to the general superintendents of each province. Gieseler, 213.

The question of administration was not, however, settled by the mere act of union. The government of Nassau introduced, in 1817, a synodal constitution into that state, at the head of which was placed a general superintendent, with the title of bishop. The Prussian government promulgated a new system in the western provinces in 1835, which combined the free working of the synodal system with the necessary checks of royal supremacy. In consideration of this concession, these provinces accepted the new liturgy. The Bavarian Protestants were also, in 1818, indulged with a sort of diocesan or consistorial system, worked through synods, a third of whose members were laymen. In Baden, a synodal constitution was introduced in 1821. The church in Würtemberg continued to be a mere department of the state on the consistorial principle.¹

26. The promulgation of the union was not without speedy effects in the region of theology.

The earliest opposition from theological quarters which assailed the rationalism of the union was from archdeacon Harms, of Kiel, who, on the day of its promulgation, published 95 theses, in imitation of Luther, in support of the strongest Lutheran doctrine. Professor Hahn, of Leipzig, followed in 1827, in a powerful onslaught on rationalism; and the same year Hengstenberg began the publication of an 'Evangelical church newspaper,' defending the old principles of Lutheran orthodoxy. The movement of which Hengstenberg was at the head, quickly absorbed all the real life and religion of Prussia. With him at first were joined Neander and Tholuck who in theology were followers of Schleiermacher, but in practical and spiritual views rose far above him in the direction of pietism. Neander substituted for Schleiermacher's *feeling of dependence* the Christian consciousness, while Tholuck went still further, and ascribed the renovation of man to a true consecration of the new life proceeding from faith in the Saviour. Hengstenberg, in opposition to these, has always maintained the Holy Scripture as the objective rule of faith and life, and devoted his powerful mind to the vindication of the assailed parts of the Bible.

27. The later developments of German theology are traceable to the influence of Schleiermacher's scientific theology and Hegel's philosophy of the absolute. There was indeed this important difference between the two—that while Schleiermacher placed the essence of religion in feeling, Hegel placed it in the knowledge of the absolute; and that while Schleiermacher drew a sharp and broad line between philosophy and doctrinal religion, Hegel viewed them as coincident. Schleiermacher, moreover, approached Christianity from a practical, Hegel from a speculative, point of view. Viewed, however, in their negative

¹ The want of a central representative synod is much felt in Germany; and several attempts at providing a substitute have been made in the church congresses, or meetings of the Kirchentag. That of Berlin, in 1853, unanimously declared in favour

of the Augsburg Confession; other similar meetings are the German evangelical conferences, the Berlin pastoral conferences, &c. Rose, p. 422. The Eisenach conference of 1852 initiated the preparation of a national Gesangbuch. *Ibid.* p. 423.

aspect, as opposed to scriptural Christianity, they were far from being irreconcilable. The man whose faith was unsettled by the criticism of Schleiermacher was prepared to embrace the mysticism of Hegel.

Both Hegel's and Schleiermacher's schools broke up into at least two parties, constructive and destructive. Among the Hegelians, Richter, Göschel, Strauss, and Bauer were destructives; Marheineke, Daub, and Hinrichs, constructive; whilst a third school went beyond Hegel in an approach to positive Christianity, at the head of whom stands the younger Fichte, and by whose influence Schelling was brought forward in his old age against Hegel. Of the school of Schleiermacher, Jonas and Sydow were destructive, Nitzsch and Twesten constructive; while here, also, a third school carried the principles of the master still further, and, by taking a higher standing-point, were enabled to reduce both elements (the theology of feeling and speculative Christianity) to a higher unity. To these belong Ullmann, Dorner, Lange, and especially Rothe. These see in Christ the ideal man, the personification of the human species, the personal recapitulation of mankind, the man of the species.¹ Rothe held that the state was the realisation of the church, and developed out of his own consciousness a system not unlike Romanism.

The chief name among the Neologians is that of Strauss, who, having at Tübingen learned to dislike supernaturalism, imbibed from Schleiermacher's teaching the taste for destructive criticism, and added to it the philosophic principles of Hegel. In 1835 Strauss published his *Leben Jesu*. In this work he attempted first to set aside all recorded supernatural events, as myths; and secondly, to build up a philosophical religion which should develope all the practical conclusions of Christianity, without any of its supposed imperfections, from principles of universal and permanent truth. Beginning with a collection of all the arguments which had ever been brought against the historical truth of the Scriptures, he marshals them in their most imposing order, and applies them, in their renovated force and collected weight, to the history of our Lord's life. It is reduced to a series of myths embodying in a fabulous form the principles and ideas of eternal truth. Christ is but an idea,² or if he ever existed he was adopted by the church as an expression of an idea, the true meaning of which is to be discovered by the philosophy of the absolute. In a later work Strauss threw away the remainder of his Christianity, and outran the wildest excesses of the Hegelian school. The effect of Strauss's book throughout Germany was instantaneous. He was disavowed both by the followers of Schleiermacher and by the Hegelians, and a storm of opposition followed. Other philosophers, encouraged by his open dealing, went even further than he

¹ Kahnis, 259.

² 'Instead of an individual we have an idea. In an individual the properties and functions which the church attribute to Christ contradict themselves; in the idea of the race they perfectly agree. Humanity is the union of the two natures—God

become man. It is the worker of miracles, the sinless existence; for sin belongs to the individual, not to the race. It is humanity that dies, rises, and ascends to heaven. By faith in this Christ, that is in his own human nature, man is justified before God.' *Aids to Faith*, 156.

had done. Feuerbach declared that God was but an imaginary counterpart of the *Ego*; religion is a monologue of the inner free feeling with itself. *Bruno Bauer* pronounced that Christ was an invention of the 'creative original Evangelist' St. Mark. Further still, Marx, Engels, and Jordan complain that Feuerbach only goes half-way with the truth; 'he labours too much on religion, mysticism, and identity; the true aim is none other than entire liberation from all religion, as the last weakness and unfreedom of the state, and as the ground of all the emptiness, soullessness, and practical godlessness of the age.'¹

The revolution of 1848 roused the German people to a sense of the helplessness of these subjective systems; materialism triumphed, and philosophy, or the spectre which had assumed its name, was dismissed to obscurity. The reaction that followed strengthened the hands of the party that acknowledges Hengstenberg as its leader; and on the progress of that party, to all appearance, the Christianity of Germany, if it is to remain a Christian country, depends.

It would be an endless task to enumerate the theological writers of this time of change, and discriminate all the shades of doctrine which give a character to the schools of religious learning. Nor is it necessary. Owing to the cheapness of all literary work in Germany, the speculations of writers, who in England would never find a publisher, are enabled to make their way into print, and there are circles of readers who read all that comes to them. But it does not follow that the influence exercised by these books bears any proportion to the noise they make. Philosophy itself has very few students outside of the universities, and what passes in England for the philosophy of German ordinary life is but the aping of depth and mysticism, which renders ludicrous the real genuine feeling of a noble people. Amongst the best-known names of the century are, among the rationalists, Wegscheider, who altogether rejects the doctrine of the Trinity; and Bretschneider, who looks on it as a mere accommodation. In church history there have been Gieseler, who views his subject from a rationalistic point, and Neander, who combines a strong historical genius with decided pietistic tendencies. Among the followers of Schleiermacher are Nitzsch, Bleek, Sack, in Bonn; Gasz, at Breslau; Lücke, at Göttingen; and Schweizer, at Zurich: among the Hegelian theologians, Daub, Marheineke, and Rosencrantz: among the Neologian doctors of Tübingen, F. C. Baur; at Wittenberg, Rothe, who, on the conservative principles of Hegel, builds up an ideal of the catholic church. The reaction in favour of positive Christianity boasts the names of Oehler, Baumgarten, Delitzsch, Caspari, Keil, Philippi, Hävernack, Lange, Harless, and Hoffmann, in scriptural criticism; in history, Rudelbach, Guericke, Schmid, Kurz, and Lindner; in doctrine, Thomasius; in practical morality, Höfling, Kliefoth, Löhe, and Petri. Nor should we omit the name of one whose influence reached for a long period over a much wider sphere than Germany,

Bunsen, a man of enormous power of acquiring knowledge, and very great genius in digesting and marshalling his acquirements; but, by the entire absence of a critical mind, carried off into gross absurdities in both history and religion.

Practical works of piety are carried on by means of an organisation of missions, which, being disconnected from the constitution of the church, are liable to very decided objections, but seem to be the only notions prevalent in Germany of doing good. The Foreign Missions of Berlin, Basel, Hamburg, and Leipzig, are flourishing societies. The inner mission, whose object is the promotion of schools and young men's associations, the providing of nurses and lodging-houses, and other works which in England are part of the parochial system, is in Germany carried on practically irrespectively of the church. The *Gustav Adolfs Union* is a proselytising society, directed against Romanism, and has had great success.

§ 28. The church of Sweden¹ is strictly Lutheran; but has retained so much of the ante-reformation character in its episcopacy and ecclesiastical administration, that extreme Protestant writers declare it to be the least Protestant of all churches. It presents the most complete specimen of union of church and state: the king is the head of the church; religious matters are discussed in the diet; the clergy are influential by their secular position. The trials through which it has passed during the last hundred years have proceeded principally from this cause. It has not been disturbed by rationalism, but has sunk too much into a mere formalism; and this has at once checked any development of spiritual life from within, and prolonged the existence of the intolerant laws inherited from earlier times. This repressive spirit has been exercised both on Protestants and Roman Catholics. The *Readers* were zealous Lutherans, who, being dissatisfied with the secularity and formality of the church as it stood, developed into a pietistic sect, and as such were encouraged by the Baptists of England and America. The persecutions under which they suffered ended only in 1853. The intolerant laws against Romanism were at the same time in full force. In 1857, the project of repealing them was rejected by nobles and clergy, and a similar one in 1858;² and the same year six priests who were converted to Romanism were condemned to exile. The influence of the present king has been used in favour of tolerance. When prince regent, in October, 1858, he suspended the law against conventicles, and allowed the readers to hold their meetings out of church hours. In 1860, as king, he submitted to the three orders of the council of the empire a royal proposition, abolishing the punishments fixed for those who separated from the national church: this obtained their assent, and passed into a law on the 21st of May.

§ 29. In Denmark,³ up to 1849, the king was supreme over the

¹ See Döllinger, 250. Karl Matthes, *Chr.* 1858, p. 109.
Allg. kirchl. Chron. 1858, p. 109.

² *Almanach de Gotha*, 1859. *Chronique*,
Allg. kirchl. Chron. 1858, p. 106, and 1861,
October 31, 1857. Matthes, *Allg. kirchl.* p. 111.

³ Döllinger, 251. Gieseler, 280. Matthes,

church, and the Lutheran was the only religion tolerated. By the new constitution of that year, the government became democratic in its character; and, whilst Lutheranism continues to be the state religion, full freedom of conscience is allowed.

The influx of rationalism from Germany into Denmark was but slow; but when it did reach it, it became almost universal. The clergy generally accepted it. In 1825, a reaction against rationalism set in, promoted chiefly by *Grundtvig*, *Rudelbach*, and *Lindberg*. These divines, by an imprudent attack on professor Clausen of Copenhagen, incurred legal proceedings. Grundtvig was fined, and retired for a time from his pastoral work. Rudelbach accepted an invitation to Germany, and left Lindberg to fight the battle of Lutheranism alone. On Grundtvig's return to his duties, a fresh struggle began on the subject of liturgical revision. The old *Agenda* was becoming obsolete, and the clergy departed from its directions very much as they pleased. At the suggestion of Grundtvig, the government attempted to enforce the observance of the old rules; but a revision was determined on, and the work committed to bishop Mynster, of Seeland. The altar-book of 1839 was the first-fruits of his labours: this was vehemently attacked by Grundtvig and his supporters, as an act of spiritual tyranny; and the resistance was so strong as to prevent the government from enforcing the new *Agenda*. The conservative party were also strong enough to throw out a new project of ecclesiastical government. In 1861, Grundtvig celebrated his jubilee, and was named by the king an honorary bishop.

The Norwegian church, by its connexion with the Danish up to 1815, was subjected to the same rationalist influences. It was resisted by Nielsen Hauge, who, like Grundtvig, was famous for his attacks on the infidel doctrines promulgated in the pulpit. He died in 1824. The same repressive system that existed in Sweden flourished in Norway also; but in 1844 religious toleration was introduced.

On a review of the church history of the ancient seats of Lutheranism, we conclude that the dark period of their existence is nearly over. The church party in Denmark is gaining ground; Sweden and Norway are awaking to the value of such relics of apostolic order and doctrine as they have retained. It is, however, too early to put an exact estimate on the movements which, under Hengstenberg in Germany, and Grundtvig in Denmark, appear to denote a return to the early faith on which both the temporal and spiritual greatness of the north of Europe were founded.

§ 30. The church historian looks in vain for the representatives of the Reformed churches in the ancient seats of their domination, Switzerland and Holland. The religious history of German Switzerland¹ reads like a chapter out of the history of Germany itself. The pietistic, rationalistic, and reactionary movements have extended their influence in much the same way as at home.

¹ Gieseler, 287. Döllinger, 212. Laing's *Notes of a Traveller*, 1st series, London, 1854, p. 147, &c.

In Basel, pietism has chiefly flourished: it is the centre of Swiss missionary life, tract and bible societies. Here Madame von Krüdener, the celebrated mystic, established her influence; and *De Wette* turned much of the religious feeling of the clergy in the direction of Schleiermacher. A terrible instance of the delusions of fanaticism took place in this canton in 1823, when Margaret Peter, a young woman who, after giving herself out as a prophetess, had fallen into adultery, was, by her own direction, crucified by her followers.

In Bern, which till 1831 had an aristocratic government, orthodoxy for the most part reigned; but in 1847, an Hegelian professor from Tübingen, named Zeller, was introduced, contrary to the wishes of a strong party.

Zurich was the stronghold of the rationalist school until 1839. In that year, the government, regardless of the remonstrances of the clergy, introduced David Strauss as professor in the university. The people rose in a body against the government, and, not content with the dismissal of Strauss, insisted on the establishment of a church synod, and that a proper weight should be given in all ecclesiastical and educational appointments to the recommendation of the church council. The government resigned rather than give way on these points, and a new one favourable to religion was substituted.

Nowhere, however, did religion fall so low as in the city of Calvin himself. There, in the middle of the eighteenth century, the clergy were accused of holding only the doctrines of natural religion; their scanty remains of doctrine fell before French infidelity; and when the time of revival came, the *venerable company*, as the preachers of Geneva are called, were found in opposition. A pietistic school, on the principles of Madame von Krüdener, established itself under *Empaytaz*, who, in 1817, accused the venerable company of denying the divinity of our Lord. At the same time, the pastor *Malan* was proclaiming the forgotten doctrine of redemption. With a hope of silencing these inconvenient monitors, the venerable company issued an order forbidding preachers or candidates to touch on the mode of our Lord's incarnation and redemption of the world, original sin, the operation of divine grace, or predestination; and restricting them, in case of any mention of these doctrines, to the bare words of scripture. Under this order, *Bost*, a young preacher, was deprived, and joining with *Empaytaz* founded a new church: *Malan* himself was dismissed from his post in 1818, and deprived of his pastoral office in 1823; he also established a separate community. In 1831, the party of orthodoxy in the church itself, connected with the reviving Protestant theology in France, established a school in opposition to the university under *Steiger* and *Hävernicks*. The influence of English Methodism and of the evangelical party has been used in the same direction. One consequence of the unsettled state of religion in Geneva has been the great increase of Romanism. The history of the Pays de Vaud is more full of religious strife than that of Geneva. Unhappily, all the movements in favour of sound

doctrine have been conducted by men who despise and abolish creeds wherever they are to be found. The result is a complete spiritual confusion and anarchy hardly less destructive than rationalism itself. The same remark applies to French Protestantism generally. The established Protestant church is a prey to rationalism and so-called methodism, which, however opposite in every principle, unite in the rejection of any confessional symbol. In 1849, the preachers declared in a body against the old confession of La Rochelle. Adolphe Monod, the most important man in the French Protestant church, was removed from his charge on the ground of Calvinism. It is needless to say that French Protestantism can boast of no great theologians. The names of A. Monod, De Gasparin, and Athanase Coquerel, are mentioned as having a local and sectarian celebrity. The only great name in the once so illustrious company of the Reformed of France is that of *Guizot*. The state of theological study in Switzerland is better, but so completely dependent on that of Germany as not to require notice.

§ 31. The rationalism and other subjective developments of Germany have been followed in Holland¹ slowly but steadily, their progress being retarded until 1795 by the rigour of the Calvinistic constitution of the church. Under the French dominion, a perfect equality was granted to all religious rites, and the church lost its old constitution without receiving a new one. This opened the way for a free-thinking spirit. German rationalism, under the forms of historical and grammatical criticism, found its way in, and the peculiar dogmas of Calvinism fell before it. The old rhymed psalter, the only book of public devotion, was discarded in 1807 for a collection of poems or hymns, partly translated from the German. In 1816, a new constitution was promulgated, the fundamental principle of which was a full representative organisation, culminating in a general synod, subject to the royal placet; it showed also a tendency towards a union of Calvinists and Lutherans. Against this latitudinarian bias of the age, Bilderdyck, the poet, raised an opposition; he was supported by Isaac Dacosta, a man of considerable power, who attacked the prevailing laxity of belief, but carried his reactionary efforts so far as to defend the slave-trade: Capadose, one of his most eminent partisans, also wrote against vaccination. Their peculiarities prevented them from gaining much influence in the church. In 1838, a secession on reactionary principles was produced by the efforts of Henry de Cock, in the province of Gröningen: this had 42,000 members in 1853.

By a new constitution granted in 1852, the greatest freedom is secured to the church, and the royal placet abolished. The theological schools of Holland at present are five:—

1. The orthodox school of the Hague, under Groen van Prinsterer;
2. A laxer school of orthodoxy at Utrecht, under Doedes, Trottet, and Chauffepie;

¹ Gieseler, 282. Döllinger, 197. Matthes, *Allg. kirchl. Chron.* 1861, p. 107.

3. A liberal school at Gröningen, on the principles of Schleiermacher, under Hofstede and others ;
4. The liberal rationalistic school of Leyden, under Scholten, to which most of the clergy belong ;
5. An ultra-liberal pantheistic school, under Opzoomer.

There are said to be indications that the first and second of these schools are gaining ground, and promoting a return to the faith of the old Dutch church, especially in the neighbourhood of Amsterdam, by excellent schools and careful pastoral work. The great influence of rationalistic principles, elsewhere exploded, is, however, not to be overlooked. It is said that, in 1854, the general synod announced that as it is 'impossible in the shortest confession of faith to unite all opinions and desires, so the church allows variations from the symbolical writings, only excepting what is essential, namely, veneration for the Holy Scriptures, and faith in the Redeemer of sinners.' The idea seems to have been lost, that a creed can be anything but an expression of human opinion.

§ 32. The external history of the church of England has been brought down in the last chapter to the year 1829. The passing of the Reform Bill marks a memorable era in both the external and the internal life of the church. Following so quickly as it did on the removal of the disabilities of the Roman Catholics, and the legal recognition of the position of the dissenters, a measure which transferred a great portion of political influence into the hands of those classes was viewed by the church herself with undisguised alarm, and by her enemies with eager anticipations of her downfall. The immediate effect of it did not answer directly the expectations of either party. The whigs, who had looked forward to a perpetual tenure of office in consequence of the change, found that, in the House of Commons, their numbers were so nearly balanced by those of their rivals, that they could not expect to retain their position without the help of the Irish radicals. Nor did they show much hesitation in allying themselves with them. The whigs had never been very well affected towards the church, although they had, from time to time, been glad to use her influence for political ends ; and probably still thought that the establishment should be maintained under their own management, as a useful engine for affecting the body of the people.

The first concession proposed to be made to the Irish radicals was contained in a measure, introduced in 1833 into the House of Commons, for the abolition of ten Irish bishoprics. The funds arising from this arbitrary interference with church property were to be applied, first, as a substitute for the vestry-cess, a charge similar to the English church-rate, which was to be abolished ; and, secondly, to the improvement of small livings, church-building, and the supplying of glebe-houses. This proceeding, although it was justified to many minds as a necessity, owing to the excitement existing in Ireland about the vestry-cess, was viewed in England as a preliminary to an attack upon church property at home. It, however, under the supposed urgency of the times, was allowed to pass into a law ; but it

gave occasion to consequences which its promoters had never calculated on—nothing less than a general movement, through all parties and schools of the church of England, towards a defence of the establishment, internal and external reform, church extension, and the renewed cultivation of theological learning. In order to understand the organisation by which many of these so desirable ends were secured, and the position of parties at the time, it will be necessary to look back a few years at the internal history of the church.

§ 33. A most cursory glance at this aspect shows many points of surpassing interest, which, however, can only be very slightly touched on in a compendium like this. Very many of the phenomena of party and school organisation are distinctly traceable to the events of the last century. The struggle with deism left a mark on theological science which is yet apparent. The church, in that struggle, was put on her defence: the very first principles of religion were attacked, the existence of God, the possibility of a revelation, the bearing of religion on human happiness. The result was a glorious triumph for the church, but the defensive armour was not laid aside; the whole of religious literature was tinged with a polemic colour, and those who were freest from the spirit of controversy were cautious, suspicious, careful of making rash admissions, bright and cold rather than warm and glowing. Proof and demonstration took the place of spiritual fervour and zeal for spiritual edification. The preaching partook of the same characteristics, and was in danger of becoming merely moral or formally doctrinal. The majority of the inferior clergy were no exceptions from the low average of manners and character too prevalent among the laity. And yet beneath this there was a strong under-current of religious feeling, and, even in the classes most remote from methodism, a powerful spiritual life developed throughout the church. The great name of Butler recalls the thought, not merely of irrefragable argument, but of humble spiritual devout piety. Much, moreover, of the spirit of the ancient church, which, in the non-jurors, had, in company with learning and respect for antiquity, been drawn aside for political reasons into a shallow channel of its own, on the extinction of the hopes of the Stewarts returned into its proper seat. Nor was the secession of the Wesleyans without an effect in rousing to emulation the energies that had, in common with the rest of the life of the country, sunk into lethargy under the first two Georges. The names of bishops Butler, Wilson, Conybeare, Wake, Potter, Gibson, Berkeley, and Lowth are instances in point. Bingham, who died in 1723, and Waterland, who died in 1740, were men whose works are not likely to be superseded in ecclesiastical and doctrinal history. It would be useless to attempt to enumerate all who, in what was called the high-church school of Anglicanism, deserved well of their own generation, and handed on the light to the next. Dr. Johnson may perhaps be looked on as the representative layman of this period. In him a most profound spirit of devotion was united with great learning, a sound critical spirit, and practical judgment. The most prominent members of this school, during the

early years of the nineteenth century, were William Stevens, treasurer of Queen Anne's bounty; William Jones, of Nayland; bishop Horsley, Dr. Christopher Wordsworth, Joshua Watson, bishops Van Mildert and Lloyd, John Bowles, and Henry Handley Norris. By their agency, the mechanism of the old church Societies for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and for the Propagation of the Gospel, was quickened and extended, and the foundation was laid of the new societies for the education of the young in the principles of the church, and for the building and repairing of churches. These men were prominent in every good work, and held views as complete and practical, on doctrine and discipline, as had been held by any part of the church since the reformation. Their efforts were well supported by the bishops and clergy generally, and were attended with great and growing success, until they received a further development in the Anglo-catholic movement.

§ 34. Side by side with these were the rising evangelical party, who also united great practical exertions with a doctrinal revival. As the high-church school runs up to the theology of the restoration, much of the peculiarity of the evangelical school may be traced to the spiritual work of Wesley and Whitfield, or even beyond them to the Calvinistic element, which had, at a much earlier period, threatened to be supreme in the English church. The views of this school are marked by a tendency to an exclusive subjectiveness in doctrine and to a low estimate of sacraments, as well as of the safeguards sought by the church in discipline and liturgical ordinances. The doctrine of justification by faith alone was exalted by them into a position which it had never held authoritatively in the theology of the English church; and the atonement of our Lord was used rather as the watch-word of a limited school than as the foundation of common Christianity. Whilst there was no reason to suppose that these doctrines were less firmly held by the great body of churchmen than by themselves, they alienated the sympathies of most moderate men by a sort of claim to be the only depositaries of the truth. The natural result of such a tone was a certain narrowness of mind, and corresponding shallowness in theology. This, however, was far from being universal among the early members of this school, and as long as their struggle was only against the irreligion and practical infidelity of the circles they attacked, it did not awake much party feeling in the church itself. Its early struggles were against men to whom religion in any practical form was repulsive. It was further consolidated by the energies of its divines, who, not content with the inheritance of the theology of the eighteenth century, laboured to endow their school with a valuable treasury of its own. The labours of Thomas Scott in commenting on the Bible, of Milner in church history, Venn in Christian morality, Simeon in preparation for the ministerial office, and many others whom it is superfluous to name, are never to be forgotten. The practical benevolence of Wilberforce weighs heavily in favour of the character of the school with the chiefs of which he was intimately connected.

The two parties thus shortly characterised did not amalgamate for general practical purposes: probably the inclination of the evangelical school to unite with the orthodox dissenters somewhat repelled the sympathies of their more natural allies. To their exertions, in common with the dissenters, is owing the establishment of the Bible Society, the Religious Tract Society, and the British and Foreign School Society; and to their own efforts the great work of the Church Missionary Society owes its origin.

§ 35. The immediate effect of the attack on the Irish church temporalities was to unite the two rival, but not yet opposing parties, in one effort. An address, expressive of confidence in the church of England, was presented to archbishop Howley, signed by 7,000 of the clergy, and was quickly followed by one from the laity, signed by 255,000 heads of families. These addresses were not confined to any party, although they were drawn up by men who were about to take a leading part in the party struggles of the next twenty years—the originators of the *Tracts for the Times*, the so-called Oxford Tracts.

§ 36. These very celebrated publications were the result of a project drawn up by four eminent members of the University of Oxford: John Henry Newman; John Keble, the author of the *Christian Year*; William Palmer, author of the *Origines Liturgicæ*; and Richard Hurrell Froude. The plan had likewise the approval of the very eminent Hugh James Rose, one of the ablest and most influential divines of the church of England. Mr. Rose, however, took no active part in the execution of the project. Other writers were soon after associated with the original four, of whom the most eminent were Edward Bouverie Pusey, professor of Hebrew at Oxford, and Isaac Williams. The first series of the *Tracts for the Times* appeared in 1833. It was characterised by simple enunciation of the primitive doctrines on the subject of church government, the apostolic commission of the clergy, the value of ordinances and of the testimony of antiquity. Many of the earlier tracts were merely reprints of extracts from the apostolic fathers and the post-reformation divines of the English church. The second volume partook of much the same character. The third, published in 1835 and 1836, contained more formal discussions on rationalism, as exhibited in certain popular religious works, a reprint of archbishop Ussher on prayers for the dead, and catenas of English authorities on the apostolic succession and baptismal regeneration. Similar catenas on tradition and on the Eucharist followed in 1836 and 1837, with a tract on purgatory, and another on reserve in communicating religious knowledge. The fifth volume contained lectures on the scripture proofs of the doctrines of the church, a reprint of bishop Andrewes' *Devotions*, and an essay on the liturgy. No. 89 was devoted to early mysticism, and the series ended with No. 90. This very famous tract was published in 1841, and contains a discussion of the nature and extent of the assent required by the church to the thirty-nine articles, in which the writer, J. H. Newman, endeavoured to show that these articles, 'the offspring of an uncatholic age, are, through God's providence, to say

the least, not uncatholic, and may be subscribed by those who aim at being catholic in heart and doctrine.'

From their first appearance the Oxford Tracts, as they were called, were assailed in no measured terms by the advocates of the evangelical school, and of the small rationalising party then rising in the church; but as the early numbers merely gave tone and utterance to the better thoughts of the great majority of the clergy, the mere virulence of opposition only served to render them more known and studied.¹ It was not, however, until 1839, that the conduct of some members of the Oxford school gave real cause for suspicion that they were approaching too nearly for their own safety to the tenets of the church of Rome. A few actual conversions to popery took place in 1841, and a very violent party contest ensued. The *Tracts for the Times* were stopped; a separation followed between the old high-church party and the more advanced followers of Mr. Newman, and a wide-spread feeling of uneasiness arose in the public mind.

Mr. Newman was at this time in a leading position in the University of Oxford, and by his great genius and learning, acute logical and philosophical power, and deep spirituality, exercised an amount of influence hard to be estimated but by those who were subjected to it. Dr. Pusey, archdeacon R. I. Wilberforce, Manning, Oakley, and a few others whose eminence was undeniable in one branch or other of theology, occupied independent positions more or less closely in support of the same views. Mr. Ward, of Balliol college, maintained sentiments far more pronounced than these, and, by his book on the ideal of a Christian church, brought down on himself condemnation by the University of Oxford, in 1845. An attempt was made to include Mr. Newman in the same censure, which was defeated by the firmness of the proctors, who exercised their ancient right of putting a veto on the introduction of the measure. With this Mr. Newman's Oxford history closed. He had already retired from the university, resigned his preferment, and in the autumn of the same year was received into the Roman church. In this step he was followed by several of his supporters, and a considerable fraction of younger clergy. None, however, of the other authors of the Tracts forsook the church of England.

The Oxford movement must be regarded as being in itself only partially successful. The unfortunate defection of the chief man of the school, first from his principles, and subsequently from the church itself, was merely the result of one of two radical defects in it. It depended too much on personal influence, and, above all, it owed much of its temporary success to a reaction against the influence of excessive Puritanism. Many of the most eminent converts to Rome

¹ The progress of their popularity was, however, rudely interrupted in 1838, when Mr. Newman published the literary remains of Richard Froude. ['These immature productions of a man of highly organised but morbid constitution of mind, were put out as oracular utterances, by the too great

partiality of private friendship. Men saw that the principles of the reformation were lost sight of in a tendency to a medieval rather than primitive antiquity, and that the history of the reformers was ungratefully and injudiciously reflected on.' Soames.]

were the children of evangelical parents. They had been early imbued with Calvinism, and their religious system lacked the recognition of the great article of the creed, the Holy Catholic Church. Disgusted with Calvinism, their minds sought a more satisfactory system in the study of primitive antiquity; and the gigantic importance of an article hitherto ignored by them seemed to throw other equally important but less novel truths into insignificance. An idea of the church was formed disproportionate alike to the rest of the doctrinal creed, and to that amount of practical realisation which may be looked for in this mixed world. Hence the defection followed. The ideal was not found at home; most erroneously it was sought where it was indeed ostentatiously offered, but assuredly was never found. No record of disappointed hopes, no returning thoughts, no regrets of the home the blessings of which they had undervalued when they had them, and having never rightly prized could hardly be expected to regret, are allowed to find utterance. *Vestigia nulla retrorsum.*

The great body of the English clergy, who were free from any personal attachment to Mr. Newman, or from the reactionary excitement against Calvinism, remained unhurt by the shock that was felt at Oxford. These, of whom Hugh James Rose (who, however, died before the crisis), J. J. Blunt, W. H. Mill, W. F. Hook, Dr. Moberly, and Sewell, may be looked on as the representatives, although for the time confounded by vulgar opinion with the Romanising school, were strong enough very early to vindicate themselves from the imputation of any such tendencies. And it is to these men and those whom they influenced, and to the generous support they met with from the heads of the church, that the measures of reform and church extension which were originated within the church herself were owing.

§ 37. Critical as was the influence of the *Tracts for the Times* and their authors, and hazardous as was the effect of the recoil when the tie that bound Mr. Newman to the church broke, from the year of the first appearance of the Tracts must be dated the commencement of a new epoch of strong life and extended energy in the English church. It was a most happy circumstance, that, at a time when she was assailed from without by bitter religious and political persecution, and within divided by almost vital differences among her most earnest children, the practical government and direction of the defence devolved on men who could in a great measure unite the strength of both parties in the common cause of the church, and who had, by their social influence and character, power to make the advantages of their position immediately available. Archbishop Howley possessed all the learning, acuteness, and temper needed for his post, coupled with a character of singular piety and humility. Archbishop Harcourt was a man of long experience, most generous sympathy with the hopes and aspirations of a younger generation, and of very considerable weight and influence owing to his personal connexions. Both the archbishops belonged to the old high-church school, and

were singularly free from any narrowness of spirit or prejudice. The real leader of the church was, however, Charles James Blomfield, bishop of London, a man of sound and extensive learning, thorough church feeling, apostolic energy and benevolence, and great administrative ability. He occupied the see of London for thirty eventful years, and there was not a single measure of reform, church extension, or social improvement, in which his hand was not at work to moderate, guide, and consolidate.¹ Under his influence, and with his sympathy, was developed a vast improvement in every branch of church administration. Theological study revived; the proprieties of public worship were again made the object of careful and anxious measures of improvement.² Church architecture, church music, Christian antiquities—a wide question, running into every true branch of art—were but the external symptoms of a revived energy, both practical and spiritual, which began to pervade the church.

Amongst these, the missionary exertions of the church in the colonies and heathen lands deserves, of course, the first place.

¹ Most of the more active bishops followed the lead of the bishop of London in practical matters. Bishops Lloyd and Van Mildert, who might have taken a more decided and independent line, were cut off too early for their church and country. Bishop Phillpotts, who, for learning and administrative power as well as strong and determined zeal may be regarded as one of the firmest bulwarks of the church catholic, had early in his career provoked political antipathies sufficiently strong to keep him in a comparatively inferior position of influence. The conduct of the church thus fell mainly into the hands of bishop Blomfield until 1845, when the appointment of Dr. Wilberforce to the see of Oxford gave him a most efficient and sympathising coadjutor.

² Mr. Soames's views on this subject are embodied in the following extract from the edition of 1850. 'Upon many young men in Oxford these revivals of Laudian and nonjuring divinity, for such they were, took very powerful hold, but little was known of them in the country at large. Their tendency, clergymen generally were aware, was to maintain what are called *church principles*; and since the public mind seemed to want such a corrective, the Oxford *Tracts* were loosely considered as useful and seasonable. In time, however, the school of theology which they nurtured, made various approaches towards Rome, and some of their pupils actually became Romanists. The great bulk showed no disposition to go thus far, but eventually, notwithstanding, became bent upon making several changes in public worship. It was contended, that various rubrics had been disregarded, neither to the credit of the clergy, nor advantage of the laity; and

that certain formalities, not rubrically prescribed, but anciently observed, might, with great propriety and utility, be revived. The chief rubrical deficiencies charged, were, the omission, when there is no sacrament, of the offertory sentences and collection, together with that portion of the old prayer of consecration, known as the *prayer for the Church militant*, and the baptizing of children at some other time than after the second lesson. The things for which no rubrical authority was pleaded, were certain positions and movements. Inconsistencies, however, were soon detected in the rubrics produced, which rendered the bare legal standing of the desired alterations rather questionable, and it was doubted, besides, whether forms immemorially sanctioned by general acquiescence, could be constitutionally changed by individual authority. Hence, in most parts of England, public worship was conducted as it had been heretofore. Where the altered system was adopted, great lay dissatisfaction generally arose, and this, in some few instances, even broke out into demonstrations of a tumultuous character. After the evils arising from this rubrical movement had spread over about two years, the archbishop of Canterbury, by a letter, addressed to the clergy and laity of his province, dated January 11, 1845, recommended that the alterations should continue where they had met with *general acquiescence*, and should not be attempted in any fresh places. As the *general acquiescence* in them had been rare, and most clergymen who had adopted them had grown weary of contention with their congregations, this letter was fatal to their continuance in the majority of instances.'

§ 38. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, which was founded in 1701, and had been chiefly instrumental in maintaining the church in North America, had, after the declaration of independence, sunk into the condition of an administrator of state grants to the clergy of North America. In the beginning of the present century,¹ it received only 425*l.* in annual subscriptions, and its whole funds reached only about 6,000*l.* Under the fostering care of archbishop Sutton, Dr. Wordsworth, and others, it began, about 1817, to show signs of revival. In 1817, it received from the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge the care of the Indian missions, which were originally founded by Frederick IV. of Denmark, but had been latterly supported almost entirely by the English church. From this moment it began a course of improvement, which has been attended with the greatest success. Its income, in 1859, amounted to 101,000*l.*, and the sums administered by it to 170,000*l.* The Church Missionary Society, which was founded in 1800, had, in 1858, a revenue of 150,000*l.* Under the care of these two societies, the colonial church has vastly extended its organisation. In the year 1830, the only colonial bishoprics were those of Nova Scotia, Quebec, Barbadoes, Jamaica, and Calcutta. In 1835 Madras, in 1837 Bombay, and in 1845 Colombo, were taken out of the diocese of Calcutta, which was made the metropolitan see of India. In 1836, the bishopric of Australia was founded, under the apostolic Broughton. This great province was subdivided, in 1842, 1847, and 1859, into the dioceses of Sydney (metropolitan in 1847), Tasmania, Newcastle, Adelaide, Melbourne, Perth, Brisbane. In 1841, the diocese of New Zealand was formed, which has since become the province of a metropolitan, with suffragans at Nelson, Wellington, Christchurch, and Waiapu, and a missionary bishop in Melanesia. In North America, the province of Canada now contains the sees of Quebec, Montreal (metropolitan), Toronto, Huron, and Ontario; and there are in North America, besides, the dioceses of Rupert's Land (1849), Fredericton (1845), Newfoundland, and Columbia. The West India bishoprics have increased to five, by the addition of Antigua and Guiana in 1842, and Nassau in 1861, besides the suffraganship of Kingston in Jamaica. The see of Cape Town was founded for South Africa in 1847. It became the see of a metropolitan in 1853, and has suffragan sees at Natal, Graham's Town, and St. Helena. A missionary bishopric has also been founded in the Zambesi country, the first prelate of which, Charles F. Mackenzie, fell a victim to the climate in the first year of his consecration. To these must be added the sees of Mauritius (1855), Sierra Leone (1852), Gibraltar (1842), Victoria (1849), and Labuan (1855).²

This great increase of church organisation received its chief impetus

¹ Rose, 406.

² We must not omit to notice the Jerusalem bishopric, founded by England and Prussia in 1841; from which great hopes were entertained at the time, of the evangelizing

of the Jews and the drawing closer of the English and Lutheran churches. The scheme, however, has been a very futile one, disappointing both the hopes of its friends and the fears of its opponents.

from a letter written by bishop Blomfield to the archbishop of Canterbury in April 1840. This was followed by a public meeting in April 1841, which drew up a body of resolutions, signed by forty-three bishops, embodying a design for church extension in the colonies which has been carried out as just mentioned. The funds by which so great a work has been supported were derived chiefly from private sources. The queen-dowager Adelaide contributed a sum of 2,000*l.*; Miss Burdett Coutts founded three bishoprics, Cape Town, Adelaide, and Columbia; that of Victoria, Hong Kong, was founded anonymously by a brother and sister. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel has contributed about 20,000*l.*; the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge about 26,000*l.*; and the Church Missionary has been chiefly instrumental in the foundation of the sees of Sierra Leone, Rupert's Land, and New Zealand. All the churches founded in this way have shown great signs of life and progress. In the Canadian and New Zealand dioceses, synodical action and free election of bishops have been attained.¹ Everywhere, however, great difficulties have had to be surmounted, and in several of the colonies all aid from the state to the church has been refused. Nor has the government at home shown any favour to missionary enterprise. The whig government, soon after the Reform Bill, stopped a grant of 15,000*l.* to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and, in 1856, withdrew the queen's letters, which had been granted to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge since 1815, and to the National Society since 1823.

Another point, to which the attention of churchmen was directed early in the century, was the education of the poor. The old foundation-schools had ceased to give that sort of instruction which was necessary for the labouring classes, and were either altogether in abeyance, or useful only to those who were rich enough to provide schools for themselves. Private charity had done a good deal, and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge had devoted much attention to the matter, but the whole department of education had been sadly neglected. In the year 1811, the National Society was formed for the education of the children of the poor in the principles of the Church of England. It met with great support immediately, and, in 1813, provided education for 40,000 children. The British and Foreign School Society had been instituted by a mixed body of churchmen and dissenters shortly before this. In 1834, the subject of education was taken up by the House of Commons, and a grant of 20,000*l.* was made annually until 1839, which was divided between the National Society, as representing the church, and the British and

¹ Under each of the bishops institutions have been founded to foster and extend the infant growth of the churches. In several dioceses, cathedrals with chapters have been constituted on the ancient pattern, and colleges for the training of missionaries instituted. Of these the most eminent are

Bishop's College, Calcutta, for the training of native clergy, founded by bishop Middleton, and endowed by his friends as a monument to his memory; King's College, Nova Scotia; Lennoxville, in Canada; Codrington College, Barbadoes; Christ's College, Tasmania.

Foreign School Society, as representing dissenters. In 1839, the government brought forward a scheme of education: a committee of privy council was appointed to administer the grants of public money, and a secular system, excluding religious teaching, was formally proposed. This passed the House of Commons by a small majority, but, in the House of Lords, was met by archbishop Howley, who proposed a series of resolutions, drawn up by the bishops, embodied in an address to the crown. In spite of the opposition of the ministers, this was carried by a triumphant majority, and the address was presented by the peers in procession at Buckingham palace. Although the answer was unfavourable, the victory was really won, and the church recognised by the state as the proper educator of the people. A few months after, an arrangement between the church and state for the inspection of the church schools was perfected; and this, with some modifications, is still in force. There have been, however, several struggles between the managers of church schools, the National Society, and the privy council, since 1839, in which the council has, under liberal influences, attempted to draw back from the status then established. The amount of the educational grant in 1862 was 842,119*l.*, of which far the largest portion was received by the church schools. The number of children receiving education in schools connected with the National Society, is above a million and a half.

The vast increase of population had made the provision of church accommodation a matter of pressing necessity at the beginning of the century. Besides important public measures for church-building, a society was instituted for the purpose in 1818, which, in 1862, had provided seats for 1,236,711 persons. Besides what was done by the agency of the society, immense efforts were made by private individuals, under the influence, more or less, of the bishop of London. The names of Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Cotton, and Mr. Hubbard must ever be remembered amongst the first in promoting this good cause.

The labours of the Pastoral Aid and Additional Curates Societies have striven to meet the needs of the people in another way. The venerable Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has shared the impetus which developed the resources of the church in this direction, and, between 1800 and 1857, the funds at its command advanced from 10,000*l.* to 100,000*l.*

The development of educational work was not, however, confined to the poor. The university of Durham, founded by the zeal and liberality of bishop Van Mildert, received its charter in the year after his death, and for several years maintained, under its original management, the character of one of the best schools of theology in the kingdom. Theological colleges were founded in various dioceses, by the zeal and influence of the bishops. St. Bees, founded in 1816; Chichester, 1839; Wells, 1840; Cuddesdon, 1854; Lichfield, Salisbury, and Exeter, are already sending out a supply of earnest and intelligent clergymen. Private enterprise or bene-

volence has founded, and conducted with the same success, a theological department in Queen's College, Birmingham, and the theological college of St. Aidan's, Birkenhead. King's College, London, continues to maintain a sound character for discipline and theology. And the list may be fitly closed by the mention of the munificent foundation, or restoration, of the convent of St. Augustine, at Canterbury, as a college for the training of missionaries for the heathen. This was accomplished chiefly by the magnificent liberality of Alexander J. B. Beresford Hope, in 1848. It would be going too much into detail to name the innumerable societies through which the revived energy of the different parties in the church chose to act for the minor purposes of practical benevolence.

Theological study has, however, occupied a place in the interests of the age which cannot be left unnoticed, although only the mere names of the writers on the different branches of it can be given. Foremost in church history are the names of Burton, Blunt, Milman, Neale, Robertson, Churton, Hook, W. Palmer, and bishop Kaye. The languages of Scripture have never perhaps possessed more enlightened or indefatigable students than M'Caul, Mill, Pusey, Grinfield, and Scrivener. The writings of the fathers have been re-edited and illustrated by the labours of Marriott, Barrow, Jacobson, and others.

A like work was done for the writers of the English Reformation by the Parker Society, and the chiefs of the Caroline school of divinity have reappeared in the library of Anglo-Catholic theology.

But, after all, the great feature of the revival may be looked for in that extension and administration of the parochial system which has produced so wonderful a change in the religious complexion of Yorkshire and Lancashire, in which the leaders were Dr. Hook, vicar of Leeds, and archdeacon Musgrave, of Halifax, nobly supported by the laity of those important centres, and guided by the just, firm, and sympathising wisdom of the present archbishop of Canterbury. The importance and extent of the revival of the church in the north can only be judged by those who have lived through it.

§ 39. It must not, however, be supposed that this period of increased and enlightened energy was one of peace or security to the church. Contemporary with her greatest exertions were some of the heaviest trials that the defection of friends, the contests of parties, or the assaults of open enemies could originate. The stream of conversions to Rome continued more or less strongly till 1853. Among the most eminent of the deserters were archdeacon Manning, archdeacon Wilberforce, and Mr. Allies, from among the clergy; and Mr. James Hope, Sir George Bowyer, and Mr. Baddeley, from the laity.

The party warfare has found vent, not merely in the pages of controversial pamphlets and newspapers, but in hard-fought struggles in the courts of law. The first of these was the 'stone-altar case,' in which the incumbent of St. Sepulchre's, at Cambridge, succeeded in removing a stone altar which had been placed in his church by the zèal of the restorers, the Cambridge Camden Society. The point was argued with

as much zeal as if the determination of the sacrificial character of the holy Eucharist had depended on the material of which the altar was built, and was determined in favour of the incumbent in 1845.

The more celebrated Gorham case followed. In this the bishop of Exeter refused to institute Mr. G. C. Gorham to a living in his diocese, unless he could give satisfactory answers to certain questions proposed by the bishop to determine whether his views on baptismal regeneration were in agreement with those laid down in the articles and liturgy. Mr. Gorham maintained his view on the principles of modified Calvinism, that only such children are regenerate in baptism as God by a previous decree has predestined so to be. After a long and distressing discussion before the judge of the Arches court, who gave judgment in favour of the bishop, Mr. Gorham's opinions were declared by the judicial committee of the privy council not to be fatally contradictory to the standards of orthodoxy in the church, and he was instituted to his benefice, on the continued refusal of the bishop, by the archbishop of Canterbury. This judgment of the judicial committee was the source of great excitement. It was publicly repudiated by the bishop of London, who was one of the judges, and understood to be against the convictions of others of the body. The unfitness of the court itself to decide on spiritual causes was loudly complained of. The immediate effect of the judgment was, however, to direct the attention of the clergy to the foundations on which the belief of the church rests, and to confirm them in the support of the doctrine.

§ 40. The church was hardly recovered from the excitement into which it was thrown by the Gorham decision, when the 'papal aggression' took place. Pius IX. marked the year 1850 by the foundation of a complete Roman hierarchy in England, and division of the country into twelve new dioceses. This measure was unfortunately received by the English nation in such a way as to render any prudent action almost impossible. The bishops apparently felt themselves unable to guide the frantic excitement of the public mind to any good end, and were silent when a dignified protest from them might have allayed much unhappiness, and been useful, in no small degree, in setting the apostolic character of their church before the eastern and western churches. But the gentle wisdom of Howley had been removed in 1847, and no display of energy could be looked for in the highest places. A futile measure was carried in the parliament, prohibiting the use of the new titles by the Romish hierarchy, but it was confessedly a dead letter from the beginning. The principal result of the act of pope Pius has been the greater organisation of Roman churches throughout England, the resuscitation of monastic societies, and a general attempt at proselytism, by means of schools and other institutions for the poor. The promulgation of this act, which disturbed the decorum of every parish and household in the kingdom, drew forth from Lord John Russell an imprudent letter to the bishop of Durham, Dr. Maltby, published in the *Times* newspaper, in which he endeavoured to divert the action of popular excite-

ment, and direct it against the high-church or Anglo-Catholic party in the church. In this he was unfortunately successful. They were immediately attacked violently in public meetings, and by the unscrupulous writers in the newspapers. The restoration of decent solemnity and beauty in public worship was stigmatised as mummery; the leaders of the church were described as on the high road to Rome, and riots occurred in some of the London churches, which seemed to threaten a revival of the Puritan tyranny of former days. It was some time before this subsided, unfortunately not without driving several valuable clergymen and distinguished laymen into the snares of Romanism. Two celebrated prosecutions, moreover, took their rise from this period — the ‘Denison case,’ and the ‘ecclesiastical ornaments case.’ The first of these originated in 1853. Archdeacon Denison, as examining chaplain to the bishop of Bath and Wells, had put questions to candidates for orders, and maintained in sermons doctrines that seemed to the low-church party to show that he held views on the holy Eucharist approaching to those of the church of Rome. A clergyman was found to institute proceedings against the archdeacon: on the bishop’s refusal to adjudicate the case, the archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Sumner, was obliged by the Court of Queen’s Bench to entertain the suit; and after various legal forms had been gone through, he deprived Mr. Denison of all his preferment. This judgment, which was generally looked upon as a party proceeding, was appealed against by the archdeacon, in the Arches court. There, on a point of form, it was quashed, and this decision confirmed by the judicial committee in 1858; the case not being argued on its merits in either court. The actual result of the suit was similar to that of the Gorham case on the question of baptism. The church ornaments case, between the churchwardens and incumbent of the churches of St. Paul and St. Barnabas, Knightsbridge, ran the gauntlet in the same way. The contest terminated in a sort of compromise of details, which was a substantial victory on the side of the maintainers of decent and even magnificent furniture of churches.

§ 41. The church which, in spite of the divisions of party and the excitement of popular feeling, could maintain without flagging her exertions for the benefit of mankind, both at home and abroad, could hardly be thought unable to debate on her own circumstances in her own lawful assembly. It was felt by the government of the country that the practical abeyance into which the convocation of the clergy had so long fallen, in consequence of the political phenomena of George II.’s reign, should now terminate, at least so far as the right of debate extended. This body, which had for a century continued to meet *pro forma* and immediately adjourn, was, after some minor proceedings in 1847, allowed gradually, from 1852, to resume its functions, and now enjoys the character of a leading power in church administration. The results of its deliberations, though not stated in the forms of decisions and decrees, are looked upon by the great mass of the clergy and laity as the formal expression of the

collective wisdom of the chief men in the church, and received with even more respect and consideration than any more peremptory measure of administration would meet with. At the same time, considerable efforts have been made, both within and without this assembly, to reform its constitution, so as to admit of the introduction of the representatives of lay opinion. These have been hitherto without result; but the question has been well mooted, and a practical substitute for much that might be expected from the adoption of such a plan has been found in the holding of church congresses, under proper supervision, which have been held in 1861 at Cambridge, and in 1862 at Oxford.

§ 42. We have now to mention the principal measures of reform in the administration of the property of the church, which were carried into effect during the period of controversy and excitement above described. Some of these were imperatively called for in consequence of such standing anomalies as had, indeed, been harmless when the means of the church were quite equal to the work in hand, but had now become, under the vast increase of population, and under the fire of political enmity, very much in need of correction. The measures which were then actually taken almost all partook of a double character: the necessity of some such acts was indisputable; but the actual colour of those adopted was derived in too great proportion from the pressure of the circumstances of the time. First in order and importance came the establishment of the ecclesiastical commission. This owed its existence partly to the excitement against the church establishment, awakened and fostered by the agitators of the reform movement, to provide themselves with political capital. The inequality of benefices, the abuses of non-residence, the iniquity of sinecures, were convenient topics for declamation. But, also, they were undeniable evils which the rulers of the church, Howley and Blomfield in particular, had been long trying to remedy. A commission of inquiry into church statistics was issued by earl Grey in 1831. It was renewed in 1833 and 1834, and in 1835 presented a report, in consequence of which, in 1836, an ecclesiastical commission was incorporated 'with power to hold real property, to receive episcopal and capitular incomes, and to frame schemes for ecclesiastical purposes which, when ratified by orders in council, were to have the force of law.'¹ One of the first propositions of the commission was the readjustment of the dioceses, which had remained for the most part unaltered since the conquest, with the exception of the additional sees created by Henry VIII. These districts, which were from their origin of very different extent, had now become, by the varying rates of increase in population, very glaringly out of proportion to each other. It was therefore proposed that two new sees should be constituted in the province of York, and that, as it would be difficult to increase the number of spiritual peers in parliament, the sees of Bristol and Gloucester should be united, and likewise

¹ Blomfield's *Life of Blomfield*, i. 212.

those of St. Asaph and Bangor. At the same time, several other alterations in the boundaries of the dioceses were proposed, to take effect as circumstances should permit. The object of all was to equalise the burden of diocesan administration, and secure a corresponding equality of episcopal incomes. In 1836, the see of Ripon was founded, and Bristol united with Gloucester. In consequence, however, of strong opposition to the union of Bangor and St. Asaph, that portion of the scheme was not carried out. The additional bishopric of Manchester was, notwithstanding, founded in 1848, on the proviso that the junior member of the order of bishops for the time being was not to be entitled to a seat in the House of Lords. These improvements were, for the time, destined to stop at this point, although the ministry, in 1846, promised the erection of four new sees; nor have either the urgent representations of commissions or the earnest wishes of churchmen prevailed in effecting the erection of those which are required in Cornwall, Northumberland, and, above all, in the neighbourhood of London.

It is to be lamented that the ecclesiastical commissioners, in securing the equality of episcopal incomes, thought themselves obliged to separate in some instances the ancient estates of the sees from the sees themselves, to which they had belonged for more than a thousand years, and the possession of which constituted one of the most tangible external proofs of the personal identity, if we may so speak, of the English church.

The same year (1836), the commutation of tithes in kind into a variable rent-charge was determined on by act of parliament.

In 1838, under the management of the ecclesiastical commission, an act for restraining pluralities was passed; and thereby one of the abuses against which most indignation was felt was effectually abolished.

In 1840, the same body carried a project of cathedral reform, which deserves credit for the good intentions of its framers, but has unfortunately retarded, if not rendered impossible, any plan for making those ancient institutions the means of maintaining a learned and useful clergy, freed from the necessary labours of the parochial ministry. The cathedral bodies had never been popular with that puritanical school which had leavened so largely ordinary religious opinion in England. They were at this time out of favour also with the more active and disinterested administrators of church property, such as archbishop Howley and bishop Blomfield were. Deaneries and prebends seemed to have become, indeed, mere sinecures, and were used as rewards of political partisanship, or as the gifts of a recognised nepotism. The contrast between the wealthy sinecurists of St. Paul's cathedral and the wretchedly paid curates of the outskirts of London, was perhaps one of the chief inducements that led the commissioners to insist on a reform. By this act the residentiary canonries in most of the cathedrals were reduced to four, and residence was to be strictly enforced. The non-residentiary stalls were entirely stripped of their endowments and patronage, remaining as merely honorary dig-

nities. The mass of property released by these confiscations was to be applied to the augmentation of small livings. The administration of these funds has been, doubtless, attended with great benefit to the country; but it is to be regretted that the machinery of the commission should have been so expensive, that so little regard has been generally paid to local claims, and that the ancient estates of the church should have been unnecessarily alienated, not only from their original owners, but from the church altogether. But, above all, the approach to a stipendiary system has awakened the most anxious fears of the true friends of the church.

§ 43. The attitude of the dissenters towards the church of England has been too marked, ever since the enactment of the reform bill, to be passed over without a brief review. The immediate effects of that measure upon the church were not such as to realise the fears of her friends or the hopes of her enemies. But from that period the efforts of political dissenters have been directed steadily towards the overthrow of the church; and in this they have at times seemed almost successful, being able, by their wealth, influence, and organisation, to make their support almost necessary to the successive liberal governments. Nor should it be forgotten that their importance has been in some measure increased by the internal divisions of the church. For that portion of the clergy which, in doctrinal tenets, approaches nearest to the Calvinistic school, has been always prone to overlook the line of demarcation between the church and the sects, and to propound schemes of comprehension which can only be perfected by the ejection of the stricter church party from the establishment. These schemes of comprehension have more lately found patrons in the liberal section of the religious world, which, by itself, is most averse from Calvinism.

The exclusion of dissenters from the universities, and their obligation to pay church-rates, were their two great grievances up to the year 1851. A proposal to put an end to the former disqualification was moved annually in the House of Commons, and went no further. The abolition of church-rates was also contemplated by lord Melbourne's ministry in 1837, the substitute being sought for in the confiscated estates of the cathedrals. This was dropped in consequence of the opposition of the bishops. The dissenters, moreover, injured their own cause by their extreme bitterness, one of their leading ministers in London going so far as to say that the church of England destroys more souls than it saves. The detection of the exaggerated statements of ecclesiastical wealth tended also to determine popular opinion against any forcible change. Still, projects for revision of the liturgy, so as to comprehend dissenters, and for the abolition of their more substantial grievances, were constantly being mooted.

The year 1851, however, was the era from which must be dated that organised attack on the church from without, which has been the most lively political topic of late years.

In that year the census of England and Wales was taken, with a

deviation from the former mode in the shape of an enumeration of religious bodies. It was found that the number of persons attending divine service in church on the 31st of March amounted to 5,292,551, while those who attended the services of dissenting communities, including Roman Catholics and every description of sects, were not less than 5,603,415. By an ingenious manipulation, these figures were made to prove that the number of dissenters was equal, if not superior, to that of churchmen. Some of their oracles went so far as to claim all non-attendants at church on that particular day as dissenters. It was in vain urged, on the side of the church, that the statistics were fallacious, that the meeting-houses were packed in preparation for the census, and that the sum of the sects, which were at variance with each other as decidedly as any of them were with the church, represented a merely imaginary contrast to the numbers of churchmen. Statistics were brought forward on the side of the latter, proving, from the returns of baptisms, marriages, and education, that at least 80 per cent. of the population was receiving the ministrations of the church. But, notwithstanding, the zeal of the dissenting bodies (from which the Wesleyan Methodists form a very large and honourable exception) was so strong, and their power of pressure in parliament so great, that they not only procured the ventilation, during several successive years, of measures hostile to the church, but succeeded in winning to themselves some decided advantages. The chief of these was the admission of dissenters into the universities, which formed one of the provisions of the scheme of university reform which became law in 1854. By the 43rd and 44th sections of the Act, 17 and 18 Victoria, c. 87, it was enacted that it should be no longer necessary to make a declaration, or to take an oath, on matriculation, or on admission to the degree of bachelor of arts, laws, medicine, or music. The oaths and declarations were still retained before admission to the degree of master of arts, on the possession of which depends the tenure of authority in the university; and the colleges continue to require the same on election to fellowships. It is, therefore, now a principal object with dissenters to do away with these declarations, and so to obtain a better footing in the universities. The provisions of the Act of Uniformity are in the way, and these they have not yet overcome. The operation of the University Reform Bill has, in other respects, tended to the injury of the church in a temporal point of view: the abolition of a great number of clerical fellowships has increased the difficulty of maintaining a learned clergy, and even discouraged the taking of holy orders in a considerable number of students.

Amongst the innumerable schemes promulgated by the active political dissenters are bills for the total abolition of church-rates, for the permission of burials in churchyards by dissenting ministers, for the admission of dissenters as trustees of grammar schools, and for the abolition of the declaration required of public functionaries that they will do no act of hostility to the church.

Some of these have had a temporary success, and have even passed the House of Commons at times with large majorities, but none has

yet been carried through the House of Lords; and, latterly, they have failed to pass the lower house, the temper of which, since 1858, has been essentially conservative.

The refusal of the dissenters, in 1861, to submit to a census of religion to be taken by the acknowledgment of each household, has also contributed largely to dispel the mischievous effects of the enumeration of 1851.

Among other measures not bearing on the church controversy, largely supported by dissenters and opposed by churchmen, that for legalising marriage with the sister of a deceased wife has been very notorious. The bill for legalising divorce, and abolishing the jurisdiction of the church in causes of marriage and probate of wills, was carried in 1857, in spite of strong opposition from the church, and only became law by a very narrow majority. In 1858 was effected, after a contest of twelve years' duration, the admission of Jews into the lower house of the legislature.

§ 44. In close connexion with the dissenting measures must be mentioned the different projects for altering the liturgy of the church, which have been advocated by Lord Ebury, and that for introducing certain changes, or more stringent rules, into the ritual, which Lord Shaftesbury has from time to time brought forward. The latter of these has never met with more than a very limited acceptance. The former possesses, however, many noisy and some specious advocates. A measure for revising the liturgy, to bring it more closely in accord with the dogmatic theology of the evangelical party, was a favourite topic of discussion early in the century. But the present position of affairs seems to date from the year 1852, when a prayer-book was published containing the liturgy of the church of England curtailed of everything distinctively Christian, and ostensibly adapted for the use of other Protestant churches. This was not received with any favour: it was, indeed, such a form as none owning the divinity of our Lord could for a moment accept, and was shortly suppressed, as it was said, by its reputed author, the chevalier Bunsen, the Prussian ambassador at London, who was thought at the time to be exercising a very sinister influence in the highest ranks of society. The question thus mooted was approached from another side, in 1858, by a society of laity and clergy, who petitioned the Houses of Parliament, under the auspices of Lord Ebury, a philanthropic nobleman of more zeal than discretion, for certain changes which were thought desirable, in order, first, to render the burden of an orthodox ritual less oppressive to the consciences of men who had formed views at variance with it, and, secondly, to eliminate from the church those who, from their maintenance of the doctrines of the sacraments, of which the Prayer-book is the express exponent, were erroneously looked upon as verging towards Roman principles. The petition of this society was met by a counter-petition, signed by more than ten thousand clergymen; but the agitation was nevertheless continued, and the proposal is now annually renewed, though not always on the same, or even on consistent, grounds.

§ 45. We have now to turn to a subject on which the minds of thoughtful men are centred at the present day almost exclusively—the attempts made by a liberalising party in the church to relax the terms of doctrinal belief, and to introduce a rationalistic element into the national religion. The liberalism of the clergy in the earlier years of the century was chiefly confined to politics. Sydney Smith and the school he represented, although in political matters urgent reformers, were, on religious questions, either altogether careless, or opposed to anything beyond the too prevalent formalism of one or other of the leading schools. The liberal school of the present day had its origin in that famous cluster of scholars of which Dr. Arnold was the representative, and to which, at one time, belonged archbishop Whately, Dr. Hampden, Dr. Hinds, and a few others, men of considerable eminence. Dr. Arnold himself was a man of high and yet humble mind, of many noble designs, great power of attracting affection, great energy and sympathy for good, and eminent in his own line of scholarship. He was, partly by constitution and partly by association, opposed to any sort of dogmatism; but, unfortunately, neither a theologian himself, nor possessing the ordinary qualifications for forming an impartial judgment on theological questions. The notion that the supporters of the Oxford church movement of 1833 were secretly aiming at sacerdotal tyranny threw him into strong opposition to them, and he appeared from the first as their fiercest assailant. But he died before he saw the real tendency of church progress, and left no heir of his own peculiar doctrinal views, if he possessed any. He is thus chiefly famous as the reformer of our public school system, and as the precursor of different schools of thinkers, with whom, it may be, he would have had, had he lived, very little in common. The chevalier Bunsen, with whom he was united in close friendship, was for many years resident in England, and represented to the popular mind the tendency to the rationalistic and semi-rationalistic views which were prevalent on the continent, and were unscientifically included by the English in a lump under the name Germanism.

Dr. Hampden, now bishop of Hereford, was another liberal divine: the contests to which his successive promotions by the whig ministries gave rise, were some of the warmest on record, both in the University of Oxford, in which he was made Regius Professor of Divinity by Lord Melbourne in 1836, and in the church at large on his appointment to the see of Hereford in 1848. There can be little doubt now that prejudice and ignorance had some share in the excitement on both sides; political prepossessions being strongly at work, and the actual tendency of Dr. Hampden's views being known but to few. It is quite unnecessary now to reopen the exact question, which turned on some rationalistic views of Holy Scripture. Some of Dr. Hampden's most prominent assailants have since confessed that they acted in ignorance of his real opinions; and he himself, in the offices of professor and bishop, has shown his attachment to, and sense of the duties incumbent on him as a chief minister of, the church. Nor

has archbishop Whately or Dr. Hinds ever been suspected of any approach to the views of the German Neologians.

These views, however, met with occasional supporters among the pupils and followers of Arnold; and other men of mark and importance, not connected with the university or the church, adhered to some one or other of the Neologian schemes in the metaphysics and the history of religion, and to that rationalistic criticism of the books of Holy Scripture which had, since the middle of the last century, run riot in Germany.

Under the general term of liberals may be included also the knot of eminent writers and philanthropists who look on Mr. Maurice, formerly professor in King's College, London, as their leader—a man of whom it is impossible to speak without admiration and esteem. Mr. Maurice, in consequence of his views on the nature of the atonement of our blessed Lord, and especially on the duration of the punishment of the wicked in a future state, found himself in opposition to the majority of the English clergy of both the great parties. Besides these, there were, and are, some few isolated thinkers who, having been under the influence of J. H. Newman at Oxford, by the revulsion of feeling and conviction induced by his fall, were hurried into a direction towards freethinking views. These, however, were few, and it would be absurd to impute to them any great influence. The freethinking movement of the present day is not a reaction on the dogmatism of the Oxford school of 1833, one of the chief aims of which was to counteract its even then apparent direction: it is possible, however, that the progress of the former may have been much aided among the younger men by the misrepresentations and misapprehensions of the character of the Oxford school which were so long current, and under which it in a measure succumbed. It is certain that the great doctrines against which the attacks of freethinkers are now directed, are held by both high-churchmen and evangelicals.

It is not intended that a reader should suppose that these different classes of thinkers are united in any common design, unless, indeed, it be thought that some scheme of comprehension is common to them all. It is rather in their opposition to the characteristic teaching of the English church that they can be looked on in conjunction than in any community of opinions or doctrines.

§ 46. The first indication of any controversy in the church on the subject of rationalism will be found in the *Bampton Lectures* of Professor Mansel, at Oxford, in 1858. In these, that eminent philosophical divine showed with great ability the absurdity of attempting to find a metaphysical basis for religious truth, and suggested a theory of divine revelation which might obviate the objections of those who found in some parts of Scripture declarations to which their moral sense could not subscribe. In doing this he seemed to some persons to yield too much to scepticism: he was charged with denying that man can have any true knowledge of God, and several of his most careful propositions were drawn by the eagerness of opponents into deductions against which he had most cautiously provided. The

lectures were, although abstruse, acceptable and popular. The divines of both the great schools welcomed them as a confutation of the rationalistic and emotional theories of Germany; they were also violently attacked. Amongst the many assailants of Mr. Mansel, Mr. Maurice alone deserves mention; and his attacks seem to have been founded on a misapprehension of Mr. Mansel's object and diction. Some warm controversy was being carried on, when the attention of the church was forcibly arrested and turned in another direction by a phenomenon which has thrown the Bampton Lecture controversy into utter oblivion.

A volume of essays appeared in the spring of 1860, under the title of *Essays and Reviews*. This contained seven articles: the first by Dr. Temple, head master of Rugby school, on the education of the world, a *rechauffé* and expansion of Lessing's essay on the same subject. Another was devoted to a proof of the impossibility of miracles, by Professor Baden Powell. A review and encomium on Bunsen's labours in history, as bearing on the inspiration of Holy Scripture, by Professor Rowland Williams; a scheme of comprehension by elimination of dogmatic theology in a national church, by Mr. H. B. Wilson; an article on the divinity of the eighteenth century, by Mark Pattison, now rector of Lincoln college, Oxford; one on the Mosaic cosmogony tried by the discoveries of modern geology, by Mr. Goodwin, a layman, and ex-fellow of Catherine hall, Cambridge; and a long essay on the interpretation of Holy Scripture, by Professor Jowett, of Oxford, completed the volume. Two of the seven essayists were Cambridge men; five were of Oxford: of these, one belonged to the school of Whately and Arnold; one, or possibly two, represented, in some measure, the revulsion from the influence of Newman; whilst the other two had been, throughout their academic life, strongly opposed to high-church views. The essays were pleasantly and popularly written, and ran quickly through several editions. Immediately there was a loud cry that these audacious attempts to shake the faith of the nation should be answered; and two sets of very able answers were published—one under the auspices of Dr. Wilberforce, bishop of Oxford; the other under the editorship of Dr. Thomson, soon after created archbishop of York. A protest against the doctrines of the essayists, embodied in an address to the archbishop of Canterbury, was signed by 8,500 of the clergy. Legal proceedings were commenced against Dr. Williams and Mr. Wilson, which resulted in their condemnation to a year's suspension; but against this appeal was made. An attempt was also made to bring Professor Jowett to trial for the dangerous views exhibited in his essay, and propagated by him as professor; but this failed in consequence of legal difficulties.

The public mind was thoroughly excited by this discussion, when it also was superseded by one of the results of which we can only guess—the publication by Dr. Colenso, bishop of Natal, in South Africa, of three successive volumes on the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, in which he attempts to show, by calculations, chiefly arithmetical, on the data of

the sacred books, that they are unhistorical in character, and can only be looked on as embodying a divine revelation, not as constituting one. Such a work, coming from the pen of a bishop, naturally awakened great excitement. Dr. Colenso was forbidden by most of the bishops to preach in their dioceses; the commencement of legal proceedings against him being left to his metropolitan, the bishop of Cape Town.

The objections stated by Colenso were such as every man thought himself qualified to determine. And as such a spirit in handling the word of God cannot but lead to error, many were led astray by these speculations; and the liberal newspapers, in particular, availed themselves of the opportunity to abuse the bishops, and to demand the abolition of the safeguards of Christian doctrine. Although the books have been most triumphantly answered by Dr. McCaul, Mr. Birks, and others, and though the objections themselves are old, and only require an honest humble inquiry to vanish utterly, the excitement still continues, and may possibly afford a topic for a future annalist to dilate upon. Bishop Colenso has expressed his conviction that his theories will, within five years, revolutionise English opinion on the inspiration of the Bible; but he has expressed himself so strangely with regard to the authority of our blessed Lord, that we cannot suppose any sincere believer can be led astray by him—rather, any one who has ever known the benefit of sin forgiven, will be revolted at the dishonour done to the Redeemer. Advantage of these untoward events has been taken by a number of liberal politicians and a small knot of clergymen to demand the relaxation of the terms of subscription required on entering holy orders. It seems, however, a singular plea, that the assaults made on the doctrines of the church by her own ministers would justify the abolition of such safeguards as she possesses. It is, indeed, alleged, that so long as the theory of holy orders derived from the episcopate is maintained, unworthy and unbelieving men will be effectually prevented from entering the ministry; but so long as the appointment of bishops is in the hands of ministers dependent on a vote of the House of Commons, the obstacle which subscription to the articles and liturgy presents to any attempt to change the national religion, is indispensable.

§ 47. The Episcopal church of Scotland, so closely united in doctrine and discipline with the church of England, has been shaken by the same controversies that have affected the latter. The Eucharistic controversy, especially, has been waged with even more earnestness north of the Tweed than in England. Bishop Forbes, of Brechin, and Mr. Patrick Cheyne, of Aberdeen, were the champions of the more advanced school of patristic theology in this respect. With this dispute was connected the question of the maintenance or disuse of the Scottish communion office, which retains some features of ancient usage that are wanting in the English liturgy. This question can hardly be said to have been yet settled. The increased life and energy of the Scottish church during the last twenty years has been marked in other ways, especially by the foundation of the cathedral

of St. Ninian at Perth, a theological college at Cumbrae, and the excellent public school known as Trinity college, Glenalmond.

§ 48. The Irish church has been less affected by the great movements of the period than any other of the Anglican communion. The constant attacks of liberal politicians upon her temporalities, and the disputes between the supporters of the government system of education and that of the Church Education Society, form the most prominent topics in her history. The temporalities are still safe, and the disputes on education are still undecided. It must not be forgotten that great efforts have been made both in England and Ireland for the conversion of the Roman Catholics, hitherto with various success. The theology of the Irish church is commonly supposed in England to be coloured with puritanism; but there is reason to think that this idea is taken rather from the streams of Irish clergymen who find their way into this country than from the theological literature of the sister-church. The great truths of Christianity have met with defenders in the church of Ireland second to none. The name of William Archer Butler stands at the head of the list. Archbishop Whately, Dr. Lee, and bishops Fitzgerald and O'Brien are to be mentioned with great respect in controversial divinity; whilst in church history and antiquities, the learning and industry of Drs. Todd, Cotton, and Reeves, and Messrs. King and Gibbings, are deservedly conspicuous.

Efforts have been made in Ireland to revive the action of convocation, which has been in abeyance since the revolution. This is a thing greatly to be desired. It is to be wished, however, that it should be tried by itself first, before any general scheme of a deliberative council of the United Church of England and Ireland, which is the favourite dream of many clerical politicians, be ventured on. The Irish church has much more to hope from a vigorous revival and attempt to do her own work than from any closer union with the English church than she already legally and morally possesses; and the sympathies of churchmen on this side the channel would be much sooner won.

§ 49. The American church has gone on during this century enlarging her machinery and extending her sphere of operation. She now numbers more than forty bishops. She has shared the controversial troubles of the English church, and, like the English church, has come out of them strengthened and refreshed. Amongst her learned men are to be mentioned bishops Hobart and Doane, Mr. Cleveland Cox, Mr. Hugh Davey Evans, Dr. Mason, and others.

In missionary zeal her efforts have been very conspicuous. She has missionary bishops in China, in Western Africa, and at Constantinople.

It is to be lamented that the influence of this church is not felt more among the lower classes of the American people; but there is no cause to wonder that it is not so, if we reflect at all on the strong counter-influences, political and religious, that are at work to prevent it. For many years after the war of independence, to be a churchman was looked on as being identical with being a British partisan. The

leaven of puritanism was, moreover, very deep and wide in the worthiest classes of American society, and the supposed tendency of republican institutions was averse from episcopacy. There is reason to hope that these causes are on the decline. Sound churchmanship is now, in many states, taking the place of that unitarianism which arose from the remains of defunct puritanism. But there is still much to be done; and the state of religion in many parts of North America is deplorable. It is but justice to the religious communities not in alliance with the episcopal church, to notice their great missionary enterprises, which extend through all the East, and testify to great zeal and liberality, although it is much to be wished that they were guided with more wisdom and charity, and less love of proselytising from the ancient Christian churches.

Among the infinity of schools and sects, that spring up like mushrooms in this land of licence, it is needless to specify any. But the rise of the impudent imposture of Mormonism presents points so closely akin to the ancient heresies, and even to Mohammedanism, as to form a very curious subject for a philosophic historian. A fanatic, named Joseph Smith, gave out in 1823 that he had discovered some golden plates covered with Egyptian inscriptions, and containing a new revelation. The pretended translation of this revelation was published as the *Book of Mormon*; and the tenets discoverable in it were taken up by other men of some organising and administrative power, who have founded a considerable settlement, on the leading principle, apparently, of polygamy. The emissaries of the sect have been indefatigable in both America and Europe, and the so-called conversions among the ignorant classes in Wales and Cornwall have given occasion to very great sorrow and misery.

§ 50.* 'In Scotland has occurred a great secession from the Presbyterian church-establishment. Its members from the first have been averse from extraneous patronage, or the presentation, by the representatives of those who founded churches, of ministers to serve them. This aversion being entertained by a party that had aided importantly in settling William and Mary upon the throne, led to an act passed in 1690, for vesting the patronage of churches in the elders and land-owners of parishes. In the tenth of queen Anne's reign, this arrangement was by a new act set aside, and patronage reverted to its ancient channels. But many people never could be reconciled to this. Hence a feeling was constantly at work, which at length induced the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland to pass the *Veto Act*. As the law had stood since Anne's reign, the several presbyteries were bound to inquire into the competence of any person presented for a cure by the lawful patron, and if they found him competent, he was regularly to be placed in possession of the benefice. The *Veto Act*, however, did not allow presbyteries to sit in judgment upon the competence of presentees, if a majority of the male heads of families, being communicants in any parish where the pastoral charge was vacant, should

* By MR. SOAMES.

formally object to the party nominated. These objectors were not even to be called upon for any tangible reasons, but merely to declare themselves, if interrogated, free from all malicious motives, and solely actuated by anxiety for the spiritual advantage of the parish. The General Assembly passed this act, as a provisional measure, in 1834. A majority of the presbyteries, however, lost no time in sanctioning it, and hence, in 1835, it was made by the General Assembly regularly binding. A minority of the Assembly had strongly protested against it, both in 1834 and 1835, and before the latter year closed, it set the Presbyterian body in a flame. It caused the rejection of a presentee whom the indicated majority in the parish of Auchterarder disapproved, and who appealed, in consequence, to the court of session. By this body his rejection was pronounced illegal, on the 8th of March, 1838. The case now was taken into the House of Lords, and there again, on the 3rd of May, 1839, the rejection complained of was declared illegal. The General Assembly would, however, not retract; but in the same year, 1839, came to a resolution, that neither the civil court, nor the legislature, could do any more than deprive a minister of the endowments affixed to his church; questions upon the pastorship of a parish being such as none but a religious body was competent to decide. The cure, therefore, of Auchterarder was treated by the General Assembly as absolutely vacant, and that body nominated another minister to take charge of it, leaving the civil rights and fixed endowments which had provided for its incumbents wholly out of sight. Many people now thought the General Assembly to have indiscreetly exceeded its powers, and accordingly, seven ministers in the presbytery of Strathbogie determined upon a cautious obedience to the law. A presentee came regularly before them, but encumbered with objections from a majority of the communicants in the congregation for which he was presented. The Strathbogie ministers waited until this presentee had obtained a legal call upon them from the court of session, and then proceeded in the customary way for ascertaining his fitness for the cure. On this they were suspended by the commission of the General Assembly. They now sought legal protection, and thus began a contest, between the General Assembly and the Court of Session, which was protracted over about two years. At length, on the 23rd of May, 1843, an *Act of Separation and Deed of Demission* was very numerously signed, by which the subscribing ministers left the established church of Scotland, and resigned all claim to the profits and advantages of their respective benefices. Upon their secession arose immediately the *Free Church of Scotland*, which now numbers a great majority of the people of that country among its adherents, and which combines with the old presbyterian principles, that perfect self-government which can scarcely coexist with fixed endowments. Whether it was judicious to treat a clerical freehold in every parish as less useful than a power in communicants to reject pastors whom they may dislike, will, probably, hereafter be commonly thought very questionable, even in Scotland. But undoubtedly the memories of those ministers who maintained this power, in the face

of ejection from home and living, must always be respected everywhere.¹

One singular emanation from the Scottish Presbyterian Church deserves especial mention. Edward Irving, a clergyman of great eloquence and spirituality, left Glasgow for London in 1821, and here acquired an almost unprecedented popularity. Subsequently he fell into some curious opinions as to the revival of the miraculous powers given to the early church. His followers began to speak in unknown tongues, and to prophesy. He died in 1834; but his friends so far enlarged upon the basis that he had laid, as to form themselves into a community called the Catholic Apostolic Church, claiming to possess the revived office of apostleship, and going to a very extreme length in doctrine and ritual—the latter being in magnificence nearly equal to that of the Roman church. Many persons of undoubted zeal and piety have been led to adopt these opinions; perhaps no stranger phenomenon is to be found in the whole of church history than the excrescence of such a sect from the rigid puritan simplicity of Scotch Calvinism.

§ 51. The other sects, of which no mention has been made in this chapter, may generally be understood to have varied so little from their original plan as to have no history other than the biographies of their leading men. Into these it would have been foreign to our purpose to enter.

The period we have examined has been very eventful in itself—to ourselves, of course, all-important. The age that is now advancing will probably be one of not less sharp struggles and not less glorious victories for truth. But here we close our work for the time; and may He whose body that church is of whose outer history we have tried to write, speedily cleanse and purify her wholly and us in her, and present her to Himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing.

¹ 'Considerable information upon the subject of this paragraph may be found in a little book entitled, *Authoritative Exposition of the Free Church of Scotland*,

Edinburgh, 1845. Most of the details are very well condensed under the article *Veto*, in Brande's *Dictionary of Science, Literature, and Art*.

COUNCILS.

	A. D.		A. D.
Pisa	1511	Torgau	1574
Lateran V.	1512	Milan IV.	1576
Bourges	1528	Milan V.	1579
Sens	1528	Rouen	1581
Cologne I.	1536	Milan VI.	1582
Trent	1545	Rheims	1583
Augsburg	1548	Bourdeaux	1583
Treves I.	1548	Tours	1583
Cologne II.	1549	Bourges	1584
Mentz	1549	Aix	1585
Wittemberg	1551	Mexico	1585
Narbonne	1551	Toulouse	1590
London	1552	Avignon	1594
London	1563	Friuli	1596
Rheims	1564	London ¹	1604
Toledo	1565	Mechlin	1607
Cambray	1565	Narbonne	1609
Milan I.	1565	Dublin ²	1615
Milan II.	1569	Dort	1618
Mechlin	1570	Bourdeaux	1624
London	1571	Dublin ³	1635
Milan III.	1573	Constantinople ⁴	1642

POPES.

Name and Surname	Official Designation	Accession	Death
Francis Piccolomini	Pius III.	Sept. 22, 1503	Oct. 18, 1503
Julian della Rovere	Julius II.	Oct. 31, 1503	Feb. 21, 1513
John de' Medici	Leo X.	Mar. 11, 1513	Dec. 1, 1521
Hadrian Boyens	Hadrian VI.	Jan. 9, 1522	Sept. 14, 1523
Julius de' Medici	Clement VII.	Nov. 19, 1523	Sept. 25, 1534
Alexander Farnese	Paul III.	Oct. 13, 1534	Nov. 10, 1549
John Maria del Monte	Julius III.	Feb. 7, 1550	Mar. 23, 1555
Marcellus Cervini	Marcellus II.	April 5, 1555	May 1, 1555
John Peter Caraffa	Paul IV.	May 23, 1555	Aug. 18, 1559

¹ By this convocation the canons of the church of England were authorised.

² Then were enacted the Irish articles incorporating those of Lambeth.

³ This convocation received the thirty-

nine Anglican articles as the terms of conformity in Ireland.

⁴ This synod ranked Calvin among heretics.

Name and Surname	Official Designation	Accession	Death
John Angelo de' Medici .	Pius IV. . .	Dec. 28, 1559	Dec. 9, 1565
Michael Ghislieri .	Pius V. . .	Jan. 8, 1566	May 1, 1572
Hugh Buoncompagno .	Gregory XIII. .	May 13, 1572	April 10, 1585
Felix Peretti .	Sixtus V. . .	April 24, 1585	Aug. 27, 1590
John Baptist Castagna .	Urban VII. . .	Sept. 15, 1590	Sept. 27, 1590
Nicolas Sfondrati .	Gregory XIV. .	Dec. 5, 1590	Oct. 15, 1591
John Antony Facchinetti	Innocent IX. .	Oct. 29, 1591	Dec. 30, 1591
Hippolytus Aldobrandini	Clement VIII. .	Jan. 30, 1592	Mar. 3, 1605
Alexander de' Medici .	Leo XI. . .	April 1, 1605	April 26, 1605
Camillus Borghese .	Paul V. . .	May 16, 1605	Jan. 22, 1621
Alexander Ludovisi .	Gregory XV. .	Feb. 9, 1621	July 8, 1623
Maffeo Barberini .	Urban VIII. .	Aug. 6, 1623	July 29, 1644
John Baptist Pamfili .	Innocent X. .	Sept. 15, 1644	Jan. 7, 1655
Fabius Chigi .	Alexander VII. .	April 8, 1655	May 22, 1667
Julius Rospigliosi .	Clement IX. .	June 20, 1667	Dec. 9, 1669
Æmilius Altieri .	Clement X. .	April 29, 1670	July 22, 1676
Benedict Odeschalchi .	Innocent XI. .	Sept. 21, 1676	Aug. 12, 1689
Peter Ottoboni .	Alexander VIII. .	Oct. 6, 1689	Feb. 1, 1691
Anthony Pignatelli .	Innocent XII. .	July 12, 1691	Sept. 17, 1700
John Francis Albani .	Clement XI. .	Nov. 23, 1700	Mar. 19, 1721
Michael Angelo Conti .	Innocent XIII. .	May 8, 1721	Mar. 7, 1724
Peter Francis Orsini .	Benedict XIII. .	May 29, 1724	Feb. 21, 1730
Laurence Corsini .	Clement XII. .	July 12, 1730	Feb. 6, 1740
Prosper Laurence Lambertini .	Benedict XIV. .	Aug. 17, 1740	May 2, 1758
Charles Rezzonico .			
John Vincent Gan- ganelli .	Clement XIV. .	May 18, 1769	Sept. 22, 1774
John Angelo Braschi .			
Barnabas Chiaromonti .	Pius VI. . .	Feb. 15, 1775	Aug. 29, 1799
Hannibal della Genga .	Pius VII. . .	Mar. 13, 1800	Aug. 20, 1823
Francis Xavier Castiglioni	Leo XII. . .	Sept. 28, 1823	Feb. 10, 1829
Maurus Cappellari .	Pius VIII. .	Mar. 31, 1829	Nov. 30, 1830
John Maria Mastai Ferretti .	Gregory XVI. .	Feb. 2, 1831	June 1, 1846
	Pius IX. . .	June 16, 1846	

ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY.

Name and Surname	Confirmation	Death
Henry Dene . . .	May 26, 1501 . . .	Feb. 15, 1503
William Warham . . .	Nov. 29, 1503 . . .	Aug. 23, 1532
Thomas Cranmer . . .	Mar. 30, 1533 . . .	Mar. 21, 1556
Reginald Pole . . .	Mar. 22, 1556 . . .	Nov. 19, 1558
Matthew Parker . . .	Dec. 17, 1559 . . .	May 17, 1575
Edmund Grindal . . .	Feb. 15, 1576 . . .	July 6, 1583
John Whitgift . . .	Sept. 23, 1583 . . .	Feb. 29, 1604
Richard Bancroft . . .	Dec. 10, 1604 . . .	Nov. 2, 1610
George Abbot . . .	April 9, 1611 . . .	Aug. 4, 1633
William Laud . . .	Sept. 19, 1633 . . .	Jan. 10, 1644

Name and Surname	Confirmation	Death
William Juxon	Sept. 20, 1660 . . .	June 4, 1663
Gilbert Sheldon	Aug. 31, 1663 . . .	Nov. 9, 1677
William Sancroft ¹	—	Nov. 24, 1693
John Tillotson	May 28, 1691 . . .	Nov. 22, 1694
Thomas Tenison	Jan. 16, 1695 . . .	Dec. 14, 1715
William Wake	Jan. 16, 1716 . . .	Jan. 24, 1737
John Potter	Feb. 28, 1737 . . .	Oct. 10, 1747
Thomas Herring	Nov. 24, 1747 . . .	Mar. 13, 1757
Matthew Hutton	April 29, 1757 . . .	Mar. 19, 1758
Thomas Secker	April 21, 1758 . . .	Aug. 3, 1768
Frederic Cornwallis	Sept. 30, 1768 . . .	Mar. 19, 1783
John Moore	April 26, 1783 . . .	Jan. 18, 1805
Charles Manners Sutton ²	Feb. 21, 1805 . . .	July 21, 1828
William Howley	Aug. 15, 1828 . . .	Feb. 11, 1848
John Bird Sumner	Mar. 10, 1848 . . .	Sept. 6, 1862
Charles Thomas Longley	Nov. 25, 1862 . . .	

ARCHBISHOPS OF ARMAGH.

Name and Surname	Preferment	Death
Octavian de Palatio	1480	1513
John Kite	1513	1521
George Cromer	1522	1543
George Dowdall	1543	1558
Hugh Goodacre	1552	1554
Adam Loftus	1562	1567
Thomas Lancaster	1568	1584
John Long	1584	1589
John Garvey	1589	1594
Henry Ussher	1595	1613
Christopher Hampton	1613	1624
James Ussher	1624	1655
John Bramhall	1660	1663
James Margetson	1663	1678
Michael Boyle	1678	1702
Narcissus Marsh	1702	1713
Thomas Lindsay	1713	1724
Hugh Boulter ³	1724	1742
John Hoadly	1742	1747
George Stone	1747	1765

¹ Abp. Sancroft was consecrated to the see of Canterbury, Jan. 27, 1678. He was suspended for refusing to take the oaths to William and Mary, Aug. 1, 1689, and deprived, Feb. 1, 1690. He continued, however, his residence at Lambeth, and in the same style as before, until the August following, when several of his attendants were dismissed, and the scale of expenditure was lowered. He appears to have received all the revenues of the see until the suc-

ceeding Michaelmas. On May 20, 1691, he received an order from the queen to quit the palace in ten days; but not obeying, the process of legal ejectment was begun in the beginning of June; and this being completed on the 23rd of that month, he privately left Lambeth on the evening of the same day. D'Oyly's *Sancroft*, 277.

² Of the Rutland family, Sutton being an additional surname assumed by his father.

³ Ware.

Name and Surname	Preferment	Death
Richard Robinson ¹	1765	1795
William Newcome	1795	1800
William Stuart ²	1800	1823
John George Beresford ³	1823	1862
Marcus Beresford	1862	

ARCHBISHOPS OF ST. ANDREW'S.

Name and Surname	Preferment	Death
James Stewart	1497	1503
Alexander Stewart	1509	Sept. 9, 1513
Andrew Foreman	1514	1522
James Beton	1522	1539
David Beton	1539	May 29, 1546
John Hamilton	1546	April 1, 1570
John Douglas	1571	—
Patrick Adamson	1576	1591
George Gladstones ⁴	1606	1615
John Spottiswood ⁵	1615	1639
James Sharp ⁶	1661	1679
Alexander Burnet	1679	1684
Arthur Ross ⁷	1684	1704

¹ Lord Rokeby in 1777.

² By courtesy, the *Honourable*, being son of John, third earl of Bute.

³ By courtesy, *Lord John George*, being son of George, first marquess of Waterford.

⁴ He was not consecrated until 1610. Keith, 41.

⁵ 'He was excommunicated by the rebellious assembly at Glasgow, and died next

year at London, on the 26th of November, 1639, in the 74th year of his age, and was interred in Westminster Abbey, near to king James VI.'s body.' *Ibid.*

⁶ Murdered on Magus moor, within two miles of St. Andrew's, on Saturday, May 3, 1679. *Ibid.* 42.

⁷ Deprived, with the rest of the Scottish prelacy, at the Revolution.

APPENDIX.

*Extracts from the Correspondence carried on, in the years 1717 and 1718, between Dr. William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, and certain Doctors of the Sorbonne at Paris, relative to a project of Union between the English and Gallican Churches.*¹

* * * * *

In the month of November, 1717, archbishop Wake wrote a letter to Mr. Beauvoir, chaplain to the earl of Stair, then ambassador at Paris, in which his grace acknowledges the receipt of several obliging letters from Mr. Beauvoir. * * * In answer to this letter, Mr. Beauvoir, in one dated December 11, 1717, O. S., gives the archbishop the information he desired about the method of subscribing to a new edition of St. Chrysostom, which was at that time in the press at Paris, and then mentions his having dined with Du-Pin, and three other doctors of the Sorbonne, who talked as if the whole kingdom of France was to appeal (in the affair of the bull *Unigenitus*) to a future general council, and who wished for an union with the church of England, as the most effectual means to unite all the western churches. Mr. Beauvoir adds, that Dr. Du-Pin had desired him to give his duty to the archbishop. Here we see the first hint, the very first overture that was made relative to a project of union between the English and Gallican churches; and this hint comes *originally* from the doctors of the *Sorbonne*, and is not occasioned by anything contained in preceding letters from archbishop Wake to Mr. Beauvoir, since the one only letter which Mr. Beauvoir had hitherto received from that eminent prelate, was entirely taken up in inquiries about some new editions of books that were then publishing at Paris.

Upon this the archbishop wrote a letter to Mr. Beauvoir, in which he makes honourable mention of Du-Pin as an author of merit, and expresses his desire of serving him, with that benevolent politeness which reigns in our learned prelate's letters, and seems to have been a striking line in his amiable character. Dr. Du-Pin improved this favourable occasion of writing to the archbishop a letter of thanks, dated January 31 (February 11, N.S.), 1717-18; in which, towards the conclusion, he intimates his desire of an union between the English and Gallican churches, and observes, that the difference between them, in most points, was not so great as to render a reconciliation impracticable, and that it was his earnest wish that all Christians should be united in one sheepfold. His words are: 'Unum addam cum bona venia tua, me vehementer optare, ut unionis inter Ecclesias Anglicanam et Gallicanam ineundæ via aliqua inveniri posset: non ita sumus ab invicem in plerisque dissiti, ut non possimus mutuo reconciliari. Atque utinam Christiani omnes essent unum ovile.' The archbishop wrote an answer to this letter, dated February 13-24, 1717-18; in which he asserts, at large, the purity of the church of England, in faith, worship, government, and discipline, and tells his correspondent that he is persuaded that there are few things in the doctrine and constitution of that church which even he himself (Du-Pin) would desire to see changed; the original words are: 'Aut ego vehementer fallor, aut in ea pauca

¹ [These extracts were made by Dr. Maclaine, and published as an Appendix to Musheim, with a long argument from his own pen as to the purpose of the correspondence. As that

purpose will be most clearly divined from a perusal of the extracts themselves, the argumentative part of Maclaine's essay is omitted in the present edition. *Ed.*]

admodum sunt, quæ vel tu—immutanda velles;’ and again, ‘Sincere judica, quid in hac nostra ecclesia invenias, quod jure damnari debeat, aut nos atra hæreticorum, vel etiam schismaticorum, nota inurere.’ The zeal of the venerable prelate goes still further; and the moderate sentiments which he observed in Dr. Du-Pin’s letter induced him to exhort the French to maintain, if not to enlarge, the rights and privileges of the Gallican church, for which the existing disputes, about the constitution *Unigenitus*, furnished the most favourable occasion. He also expresses his readiness to concur in improving any opportunity that might be offered by these debates, to form an union that might be productive of a further reformation, in which not only the most rational Protestants, but also a considerable number of the Roman Catholic churches, should join with the church of England: ‘si exhinc’ (says the archbishop, speaking of the recent commotions excited by the constitution) ‘aliquid amplius elici possit ad unionem nobiscum ecclesiasticam ineundam; unde forte nova quædam reformatio exoritur, in quam non solum ex Protestantibus optimi quique, verum etiam pars magna ecclesiarum Communionis Romano-Catholicæ, una nobiscum conveniant.’

Hitherto we see that the expressions of the two learned doctors of the English and Gallican churches, relating to the union under consideration, are of a vague and general nature. When they were thus far advanced in their correspondence, an event happened which rendered it more close, serious, and interesting, and even brought on some particular mention of preliminary terms, and certain preparatives for a future negotiation. The event I mean, was a discourse delivered in an extraordinary meeting of the Sorbonne, March 17-28, 1717-18, by Dr. Patrick Piers de Girardin, in which he exhorts the doctors of that society to proceed in their design of revising the doctrines and rules of the church, to separate things necessary from those which are not so, by which they will show the church of England that they do not hold every decision of the pope for an article of faith. The learned orator observes further, that the English church may be more easily reconciled than the Greek was; and that the disputes between the Gallican church and the court of Rome, removing the apprehensions of papal tyranny, which terrified the English from the Catholic communion, will lead them back into the bosom of the church with greater celerity than they formerly fled from it: ‘Facient’ (says he) ‘perfecto offensiones, quæ vos inter et senatum Capitolinum videntur intervenisse, ut Angli, deposito servitutis metu, in ecclesiæ gremium revertent alacrius quam olim inde, quorundam exosi tyrannidem, avolarunt. Meministis ortas inter Paulum et Barnabam dissensiones animorum tandem coecidisse, ut singuli propagandæ in diversis regionibus fidei felicius insudaverint sigillatim, quam junctis viribus fortasse insudassent.’

After the delivery of this discourse in the Sorbonne, Dr. Du-Pin showed to Girardin archbishop Wake’s letter, which was also communicated to cardinal de Nonilles, who admired it greatly, as appears from a letter of Dr. Piers de Girardin to Dr. Wake, written, I believe, April 18-29, 1718. Before the arrival of this letter, the archbishop had received a second from Dr. Du-Pin, and also a copy of Girardin’s discourse. But he does not seem to have entertained any notion, in consequence of all this, that the projected union would go on smoothly. On the contrary, he no sooner received these letters, than he wrote to Mr. Beauvoir (April 15, 1718) that it was his opinion, that neither the regent nor the cardinal would ever come to a rupture with the court of Rome; and that nothing could be done in point of doctrine, until this rupture was brought about. He added, that fundamentals should be distinguished from matters of less moment, in which differences or errors might be tolerated. He expresses a curiosity to know the reception which his former letter to Du-Pin had met with; and he wrote again to that ecclesiastic, and also to Girardin (May 1, 1718), and sent both his letters towards the end of that month.

The doctors of the Sorbonne, whether they were set in motion by the real desire of an union with the English church, or only intended to make use of this union as the means of intimidating the court of Rome, began to form a plan of reconciliation, and to specify the terms upon which they were willing to bring it into execution. Mr. Beauvoir acquaints the archbishop, in July, 1718, that Dr. Du-Pin had made a rough draft of an essay towards an union, which cardinal de

Noailles desired to peruse before it was sent to his grace; and that both Du-Pin and Girardin were highly pleased with his grace's letters to them. * * * Accordingly, when Mr. Beauvoir had acquainted the archbishop with Du-Pin's having formed a plan of union, his grace answered in a manner which showed that he looked upon the removal of the Gallican church from the jurisdiction of Rome as an essential preliminary article, without which no negotiation could even be commenced. 'To speak freely' (says the prelate, in his letter of August 11, to Mr. Beauvoir), 'I do not think the regent (the duke of Orleans) yet strong enough in his interest to adventure at a separation from the court of Rome.' Could the regent openly appear in this, the divines would follow, and a scheme might fairly be offered for such an union, as alone is requisite, between the English and Gallican churches. But till the time comes that the state will enter into such a work, all the rest is mere speculation. It may amuse a few contemplative men of learning and probity, who see the errors of the church, and groan under the tyranny of the court of Rome. It may dispose them secretly to wish well to us, and think charitably of us; but still they must call themselves Catholics, and us heretics, and, to all outward appearance, say mass, and act so as they have been wont to do. If, under the shelter of Gallican privileges, they can now and then serve the state, by speaking big in the Sorbonne, they will do it heartily: but that is all, if I am not greatly mistaken.¹

Soon after this the archbishop received Du-Pin's *Commonitorium*, or advice, relating to the method of reuniting the English and Gallican churches. * * * Dr. Du-Pin, after some reflections, in the tedious preface, on the Reformation, and the present state of the church of England, reduces the controversy between the churches to three heads, viz. articles of faith—rules and ceremonies of ecclesiastical discipline—and moral doctrine, or rules of practice; and these he treats by entering into an examination of the Thirty-nine Articles of the church of England. The first five of these articles he approves. With regard to the sixth, which affirms that the Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation, he expresses himself thus: 'This we will readily grant, provided that you do not entirely exclude tradition, which does not exhibit new articles of faith, but confirms and illustrates those which are contained in the sacred writings, and places about them new guards to defend them against gainsayers,'¹ &c. He thinks that the apocryphal books will not occasion much difficulty. He is, indeed, of opinion, that 'they ought to be deemed *canonical*, as those books concerning which there were doubts for some time;' yet, since they are not in the first or Jewish canon, he will allow them to be called *Dextero-Canonical*. He consents to the Xth article, which relates to free-will, provided that by the word *power* be understood what school divines call *potentia proxima*, or a direct and immediate power, since, without a *remote* power of doing good works, sin could not be imputed.

With respect to the XIth article, which contains the doctrine of justification, he thus expresses the sentiments of his brethren: 'We do not deny that it is by faith alone that we are justified, but we maintain that faith, charity, and good works are necessary to salvation; and this is acknowledged in the following article.'²

Concerning the XIIIth article, he observes, 'that there will be no dispute, since many divines of both communions embrace the doctrine contained in that article' (viz. that works done before the grace of Christ are not pleasing to God, and have the nature of sin). He indeed thinks 'it very harsh to say, that all these actions are sinful which have not the grace of Christ for their source;' but he considers this rather as a matter of theological discussion than as a term of fraternal communion.³

¹ The original words are: 'Hoc lubenter admitemus, modo non excludatur traditio, quæ articulos fidei novos non exhibet, sed confirmat et explicat ea, quæ in sacris literis habentur, ac adversus aliter sapientes munit eos novis cautionibus, ita ut non nova dicantur, sed antiqua nove.'¹

² The original words are: 'Fide sola in Christum non justificari, quod articulo XImo

exponitur, non inficiamur; sed fide, charitate, et adjunctis bonis operibus, quæ omnino necessaria sunt ad salutem, ut articulo sequenti agnoscitur.'

³ 'De articulo XIIImo nulla lis erit, cum multi theologi in eadem versentur sententia. Durius videtur id dici, eas omnes actiones quæ ex gratia Christi non fiunt, esse peccata. Nolim tamen de hac re disceptari, nisi inter theologos.'

On the XIVth article, relating to works of supererogation (undoubtedly one of the most absurd and pernicious doctrines of the Romish church), he observes, 'that works of supererogation mean only works conducive to salvation, which are not matters of strict precept, but of counsel only; that the word, being new, may be rejected, provided it be owned that the faithful do some such works.'

He makes no objections to the XV. XVI. XVII. and XVIIIth articles.

His observations on the XIXth are, that to the definition of the church, the words *under lawful pastors* ought to be added; and that though all particular churches, even that of Rome, may err, it is needless to say this in a confession of faith.

He consents to the decision of the XXth article, which refuses to the church the power of ordaining anything that is contrary to the word of God; but he says, it must be taken for granted, that the church will never do this in matters which overturn essential points of faith, or, to use his own words, '*quæ fidei substantiam evertant.*'

It is in consequence of this notion that he remarks on the XXIst article, that general councils, received by the universal church, cannot err; and that though particular councils may, yet every private man has not a right to reject what he thinks contrary to Scripture.

As to the important points of controversy contained in the XXIInd article, he endeavours to mince matters as nicely as he can, to see if he can make the cable pass through the eye of the needle; and for this purpose observes, that souls must be *purged, i. e.* purified, from all defilement of sin, before they are admitted to celestial bliss; that the church of Rome does not affirm this to be done by fire; that indulgences are only relaxations or remissions of temporal penalties in this life; that the Roman Catholics do not worship the cross, or relics, or images, or even saints before their images, but only pay them an external respect, which is not of a religious nature; and that even the external demonstration of respect is a matter of indifference, which may be laid aside or retained without harm.

He approves the XXIIIrd article; and does not pretend to dispute about the XXIVth, which ordains the celebration of divine worship in the vulgar tongue. He, indeed, excuses the Latin and Greek churches for preserving their ancient languages; but as great care has been taken that everything be understood by translations, he allows that divine service may be performed in the vulgar tongue where that is customary.

Under the XXVth article he insists that the five Romish sacraments be acknowledged as such, whether instituted immediately by Christ or not.

He approves the XXVIth and XXVIIth articles; and he proposes expressing the part of the XXVIIIth that relates to transubstantiation (which term he is willing to omit entirely), in the following manner: 'That the bread and wine are really changed into the body and blood of Christ, which last are truly and really received by all, though none but the faithful partake of any benefit from them.' This extends also to the XXIXth article.

With regard to the XXXth, he is for mutual toleration, and would have the receiving of the communion in both kinds held indifferent, and liberty left to each church to preserve, or change, or dispense with its customs on certain occasions.

He is less inclined to concessions on the XXXIst article, and maintains that the sacrifice of Christ is not only commemorated, but continued, in the eucharist, and that every communicant offers him along with the priest.

He is not a warm stickler for the celibacy of the clergy, but consents so far to the XXXIInd article, as to allow that priests may marry, where the laws of the church do not prohibit it.

In the XXXIIIrd and XXXIVth articles, he acquiesces without exception.

He suspends his judgment with respect to the XXXVth, as he never perused the homilies mentioned therein.

As to the XXXVIth, he would not have the English ordinations pronounced null, though some of them, perhaps, are so; but thinks that, if an union be made, the English clergy ought to be continued in their offices and benefices, either by right or indulgence, '*sive ex jure, sive ex indulgentia ecclesiæ.*'

He admits the XXXVIIth, so far as relates to the authority of the civil power; denies all temporal and all immediate spiritual jurisdiction of the pope; but

alleges that by virtue of his primacy, which moderate (he ought to have said *immoderate*) church-of-England-men do not deny, he is bound to see that the true faith be maintained: that the canons be observed everywhere; and, when anything is done in violation of either, to provide the remedies prescribed for such disorders by the canon laws, 'secundum leges canonicas, ut malum resarciatur, procurare.' As to the rest, he is of opinion, that every church ought to enjoy its own liberties and privileges, which the pope has no right to infringe. He declares against going *too far* (the expression is vague, but the man probably meant well) in the punishment of heretics, against admitting the inquisition into France, and against war without a just cause.

The XXXVIIIth and XXXIXth articles he approves. Moreover, in the discipline and worship of the church of England, he sees nothing amiss, and thinks no attempt should be made to discover or prove by whose fault the schism was begun. He further observes, 'that an union between the English and French bishops and clergy may be completed, or at least advanced, without consulting the Roman pontiff, who may be informed of the union as soon as it is accomplished, and may be desired to consent to it; that, if he consents to it, the affair will then be finished; and that, even without his consent, the union shall be valid; that, in case he attempts to terrify by his threats, it will then be expedient to appeal to a general council.'¹ He concludes by observing, 'that this arduous matter must first be discussed between a few; and if there be reason to hope that the bishops, on both sides, will agree about the terms of the designed union, that then application must be made to the civil power, to advance and confirm the work, to which he wishes all success.

* * * * *

The archbishop declared more especially, that he would never comply with the proposals made in Du-Pin's *Commonitorium*, of which I have now given the contents; observing, that though he was a friend to peace, he was still more a friend to truth; and that, 'unless the Roman Catholics gave up some of their doctrines and rites,' an union with them could never be effected. All this is contained in a letter written by the archbishop to Mr. Beauvoir, on receiving the *Commonitorium*. This letter is dated August 30, 1718; and the reader will find a copy of it subjoined to this Appendix.² About a month after, his grace wrote a letter to Dr. Du-Pin, dated October 1, 1718, in which he complains of the tyranny of the pope, exhorts the Gallican doctors to throw off the papal yoke in a national council, since the *general* one is not to be expected; and declares, that this must be the great preliminary and fundamental principle of the projected union, which being settled, an uniformity might be brought about in other matters, or a diversity of sentiments mutually allowed, without any violation of peace or concord. The archbishop commends, in the same letter, the candour and openness that reign in the *Commonitorium*; entreats Dr. Du-Pin to write to him always upon the same footing, freely, and without disguise or reserve; and tells him he is pleased with several things in that piece, and with nothing more than with the doctor's declaring it as his opinion, that there is not a great difference between their respective sentiments; but adds, that he cannot at present give his sentiments at large concerning that piece.³

* * * * *

The archbishop's sentiments in this matter will still appear further from the letters he wrote to Mr. Beauvoir, in October, November, and December, 1718, and the January following, of which the proper extracts are here subjoined.⁴ It appears from these letters, that Dr. Wake insisted still upon the abolition of the pope's jurisdiction over the Gallican church, and leaving him no more than a primacy of rank and honour, and that merely by ecclesiastical authority, as he was once bishop of the imperial city; to which empty title our prelate seems willing to

¹ 'Unio fieri potest aut saltem promoveri, inconsulto pontifice, qui, facta unione, de ea admovebitur, ac suppliciter rogabitur, ut velit ei consentire. Si consentiat, jam peracta res erit: sin abnuat, nihilominus valebit hæc unio. Et si minas intentet, ad concilium

generale appellabitur.'

² See this letter, No. III.

³ See this letter to Du-Pin, No. V., as also the archbishop's letters to Dr. P. Piers de Girardin, No. VI.

⁴ See Nos. IV. VII. VIII. IX. X.

have consented, provided that it should be attended with no infringement of the independence and privileges of each particular country and church. 'Si quam prerogativam' (says the archbishop in his letter to Girardin,¹ after having defied the court of Rome to produce any precept of Christ in favour of the primacy of its bishop) 'ecclesiae concilia sedis imperialis episcopo concesserint (etsi cadente imperio etiam ea prerogativa excidisse merito possit censi), tamen quod ad me attinet, servatis semper regnorum juriis, ecclesiarum libertatibus, episcoporum dignitate, modo in ceteris conveniatur, per me licet, suo fruatur qualicumque primatu; non ego illi locum primum, non inanem honoris titulum invidéo. At in alias ecclesias dominari, &c. hæc nec nos unquam ferre potuimus, nec vos debetis.'

The violent measures of the court of Rome against that part of the Gallican church which refused to admit the constitution *Unigenitus* as an ecclesiastical law, made the archbishop imagine that it would be no difficult matter to bring this opposition to an open rupture, and to engage the persons concerned in it to throw off the papal yoke, which seemed to be borne with impatience in France. The despotic bull of Clement XI., dated August 28, 1788, and which begins with the words *Pastoralis officii*, was a formal act of excommunication thundered out against all the anti-constitutionists, as the opposers of the bull *Unigenitus* were called; and it exasperated the doctors of the Sorbonne in the highest degree. It is to this that the archbishop alludes, when he says, in his letter to Mr. Beauvoir, dated January 23, 1718,² 'At present, he (the pope) has put them out of his communion. We have withdrawn ourselves from him; both are out of communion with him, and I think it is not material on which side the breach lies.' But the wished-for separation from the court of Rome, notwithstanding all the provocations of its pontiff, was still far off. Though, on numberless occasions, the French divines showed very little respect for the papal authority, yet the renouncing it altogether was a step which required deep deliberation, and which, however inclined they might be to it, they could not make, if they were not seconded by the state. But from the state they were not likely to have any countenance. The regent of France was governed by the abbé Du Bois: and Du Bois was aspiring eagerly after a cardinal's cap. This circumstance (not more unimportant than many secret connexions and trivial views that daily influence the course of public events, the transactions of government, and the fate of nations) was sufficient to stop the Sorbonne and its doctors in the midst of their career; and, in effect, it contributed greatly to stop the correspondence of which I have been now giving an account, and to nip the project of union in the bud. The correspondence between the archbishop and the two doctors of the Sorbonne had been carried on with a high degree of secrecy. This secrecy was prudent, as neither of the corresponding parties had been authorised by the civil power to negotiate an union between the two churches;³ and, on Dr. Wake's part, it was partly owing to his having nobody that he could trust with what he did. He was satisfied (as he says in a letter to Mr. Beauvoir) 'that most of the high-church bishops and clergy would readily come into such a design; but these (adds his grace) are not men either to be confided in, or made use of, by me.'⁴

The correspondence, however, was divulged; and the project of union engrossed the whole conversation of the city of Paris. Lord Stanhope and the earl of Stair were congratulated thereupon by some great personages, in the royal palace. The duke regent himself and the abbé du Bois, minister of foreign affairs, and M. Joli de Fleury, the attorney-general, gave the line at first, appeared to favour the correspondence and the project, and let things run on to certain lengths. But the

¹ No. VI.

² See No. X.

³ Dr. Wake seems to have been sensible of the impropriety of carrying on a negotiation of this nature without the approbation and countenance of government. 'I always (says he, in his letter to Mr. Beauvoir, which the reader will find at the end of this Appendix, No. XI.) took it for granted, that no step

should be taken towards an union, but with the knowledge, approbation, and even by the authority of civil powers. All, therefore, that has passed hitherto stands clear of any exception as to the civil magistrate. It is only a consultation in order to find out a way how an union might be made if a fit occasion should hereafter be offered.'

⁴ See the letters subjoined, No. IX.

Jesuits and Constitutionists sounded the alarm, and overturned the whole scheme, by spreading a report, that the cardinal de Noailles, and his friends the Jansenists, were upon the point of making a coalition with the heretics. Hereupon the regent was intimidated; and Du Bois had an opportunity of appearing a meritorious candidate for a place in the sacred college. Dr. Piers Girardin was sent for to court, was severely reprimanded by Du Bois, and strictly charged, upon pain of being sent to the Bastile, to give up all the letters he had received from the archbishop of Canterbury, as also a copy of all his own. He was forced to obey; and all the letters were immediately sent to Rome, 'as so many trophies (says a certain author) gained from the enemies of the church.'¹ The archbishop's letters were greatly admired, as striking proofs both of his catholic benevolence and extensive abilities.

Mr. Beauvoir informed the archbishop, by a letter dated February 8, 1719, N.S., that Dr. Du-Pin had been summoned, by the abbé du Bois, to give an account of what had passed between him and Dr. Wake. This step naturally suspended the correspondence, though the archbishop was at a loss, at first, whether he should look upon it as favourable, or detrimental, to the projected union.² The letters which he wrote to Mr. Beauvoir and Dr. Du-Pin after this, express the same sentiments which he discovered through the whole of this transaction.³ The letter to Du-Pin, more especially, is full of a pacific and reconciling spirit, and expresses the archbishop's desire of cultivating fraternal charity with the doctors, and his regret at the ill-success of their endeavours towards the projected union. Du-Pin died before this letter, which was retarded by some accident, arrived at Paris.⁴ Before the archbishop had heard of his death, he wrote to Mr. Beauvoir, to express his concern, that an account was going to be published of what had passed between the two doctors and himself, and his hope 'that they would keep in generals, as the only way to renew the good design, if occasion should serve, and to prevent themselves trouble from the reflections of their enemies,' on account (as the archbishop undoubtedly means) of the concessions they had made, which, though insufficient to satisfy true protestants, were adapted to exasperate bigoted papists. The prelate adds, in the conclusion of this letter, 'I shall be glad to know that your doctors still continue their good opinion of us; for, though we need not the approbation of men on our own account, yet I cannot but wish it as a mean to bring them, if not to a perfect agreement in all things with us (which is not presently to be expected), yet to such an union as may put an end to the odious charges against, and consequential aversion of us, as heretics and schismatics, and, in truth, make them cease to be so.'

Dr. Du-Pin (whom the archbishop very sincerely lamented, as the only man, after Mr. Ravechet, on whom the hopes of a reformation in France seemed to depend) left behind him an account of this famous correspondence. Some time before he died, he showed it to Mr. Beauvoir, and told him that he intended to communicate it to a very great man (probably the regent). Mr. Beauvoir observed to the doctor, that one would be led to imagine, from the manner in which this account was drawn up, that the archbishop made the first overtures with respect to the correspondence, and was the first who intimated his desire of the union; whereas it was palpably evident that he (Dr. Du-Pin) had first solicited the one and the other. Du-Pin acknowledged this freely and candidly, and promised to rectify it, but was prevented by death. It does not, however, appear that his death put a final stop to the correspondence; for we learn by a letter from the archbishop to Mr. Beauvoir, dated August 27, 1719, that Dr. Piers Girardin frequently wrote to his grace. But the opportunity was past; the appellants from the bull *Unigenitus*, or the anti-constitutionists, were divided; the court did not smile at all upon the project, because the regent was afraid of the Spanish party and the Jesuits; and therefore the continuation of this correspondence after Du-Pin's death was without effect.

¹ These *trophies* were the defeat of the moderate part of the Gallican church, and the ruin of their project to break the papal yoke, and unite with the church of England.

² See his letter to Mr. Beauvoir, in the

pieces subjoined, No. XI. dated February 5 (16), 1718-19.

³ See Nos. XI.—XVIII.

⁴ See his letter to Mr. Beauvoir, No. XV.

* * * * *

The pacific spirit of Dr. Wake did not only discover itself in his correspondence with the Romish doctors, but in several other transactions in which he was engaged by his constant desire of promoting union and concord among Christians; for it is well known that he kept up a constant friendly correspondence with the most eminent ministers of the foreign protestant churches, and showed a fraternal regard to them, notwithstanding the difference of their discipline and government from that of the church of England. In a letter written to the learned Le Clerc in 1716, he expresses, in the most cordial terms, his affection for them, and declares positively, that nothing can be further from his thoughts than the notions adopted by certain bigoted and furious writers who refuse to embrace the foreign protestants as their brethren, will not allow to their religious assemblies the denomination of *churches*, and deny the validity of their sacraments. He declares, on the contrary, these churches to be true Christian churches, and expresses a warm desire of their union with the church of England. It will be, perhaps, difficult to find, in any epistolary composition, ancient or modern, a more elegant simplicity, a more amiable spirit of meekness, moderation, and charity, and a happier strain of that easy and unaffected politeness which draws its expressions from a natural habit of goodness and humanity, than we meet with in this letter.¹ We see this active and benevolent prelate still continuing to interest himself in the welfare of the protestant churches abroad. In several letters written in the years 1718 and 1719, to the pastors and professors of Geneva and Switzerland, who were then at variance about the doctrines of predestination and grace, and some other abstruse points of metaphysical theology, he recommends earnestly to them a spirit of mutual toleration and forbearance, entreats them particularly to be moderate in their *demands* of subscription to articles of faith, and proposes to them the example of the church of England, as worthy of imitation in this respect. In one of these letters he exhorts the doctors of Geneva not to go too far in explaining the nature, determining the sense, and imposing the belief of doctrines, which the Divine Wisdom has not thought proper to reveal clearly in the Scriptures, and the ignorance of which is very consistent with a state of salvation; and he recommends the prudence of the church of England, which has expressed these doctrines in such general terms in its articles, that persons who think very differently about the doctrines, may subscribe the articles without wounding their integrity.² His letters to professor Schurer of Bern, and to the excellent and learned John Alphonso Turretin of Geneva, are in the same strain of moderation and charity, and are here subjoined,³ as every way worthy of attentive perusal. But what is more peculiarly worthy of attention here, is a letter written May 22, 1719,⁴ to Mr. Jablonski of Poland, who, from a persuasion of Dr. Wake's great wisdom, discernment, and moderation, had proposed to him the following question, viz. 'Whether it was lawful and expedient for the Lutherans to treat of an union with the church of Rome; or whether all negotiations of this kind ought not to be looked upon as dangerous and delusive?' The archbishop's answer to this question contains a happy mixture of protestant zeal and Christian charity. He gives the strongest cautions to the Polish Lutherans against entering into any treaty of union with the Roman Catholics, except on a footing of perfect equality, and in consequence of a previous renunciation, on the part of the latter, of the tyranny, and even of the superiority and jurisdiction, of the church of Rome and its pontiff; and as to what concerns points of doctrine, he exhorts them not to sacrifice truth to temporal advantages, or even to a *desire of peace*. It would carry us too far, were we to give a minute account of Dr. Wake's correspondence with the protestants of Nismes, or of Lithuania, and other countries: it may, however, be affirmed, that no prelate, since the Reformation, had so extensive a correspondence with the protestants abroad, and none could have had a more friendly one.

It does not appear that the dissenters in England made to the archbishop any proposals relative to an union with the established church, or that he made any proposals to them on that head. The spirit of the times, and the situation of the

¹ See an extract of it among the pieces subjoined, No. XIX.

² See the pieces here subjoined, No. XX.

³ See these letters, Nos. XXI. XXII. XXIII.

⁴ No. XXV.

contending parties, offered little prospect of success to any scheme of that nature. In queen Anne's time he was only bishop of Lincoln; and the disposition of the House of Commons, and of all the Tory part of the nation, was then so unfavourable to the dissenters, that it is not at all likely that any attempt towards reuniting them to the established church would have passed into a law. And, in the next reign, the face of things was so greatly changed in favour of the dissenters, and their hopes of recovering the rights and privileges of which they had been deprived, were so sanguine, that it may be well questioned whether they would have accepted the offer of an union had it been made to them. Be that as it will, one thing is certain, and it is a proof of archbishop Wake's moderate and pacific spirit, that in 1714, when the spirit of the court and of the triumphant part of the ministry was, with respect to the Whigs in general, and to dissenters in particular, a spirit of enmity and oppression, this worthy prelate had the courage to stand up in opposition to the schism-bill, and to protest against it as a hardship upon the dissenters. This step, which must have blasted his credit at court, and proved detrimental to his private interest, as matters then stood, showed that he had a friendly and sincere regard for the dissenters. It is true, four years after this, when it was proposed to repeal the schism-bill and the act against occasional conformity, both at once, he disapproved this proposal; and this circumstance has been alleged as an objection to the encomiums that have been given to his tender regard for the dissenters, or at least as a proof that he changed his mind; and that Wake, bishop of Lincoln, was more their friend than Wake, archbishop of Canterbury. I do not pretend to justify this change of conduct. It seems to have been, indeed, occasioned by a change of circumstances. The dissenters, in their state of oppression during the ministry of Bolingbroke and his party, were objects of compassion; and those who had sagacity enough to perceive the ultimate object which that ministry had in view in oppressing them, must have interested themselves in their sufferings, and opposed their oppressors, from a regard to the united causes of protestantism and liberty. In the following reign their credit rose; and while this encouraged the wise and moderate men among them to plead with prudence and with justice their right to be delivered from several real grievances, it elated the violent (and violent men there are in all parties, even in the cause of moderation) to a high degree. This rendered them formidable to all those who were jealous of [*zealous for*] the power, privileges, and authority of the established church; and archbishop Wake was probably of this number. He had protested against the shackles that were imposed upon them when they lay under the frowns of government; but apprehending, perhaps, that the removal of these shackles in the day of prosperity would render their motions towards power too rapid, he opposed the abrogation of the very acts which he had before endeavoured to stifle in their birth. In this, however, it must be acknowledged that the spirit of party mingled too much of its influence with the dictates of prudence; and that prudence, thus accompanied, was not very consistent with Dr. Wake's known principles of equity and moderation. As I was at a loss how to account for this part of the archbishop's conduct, I addressed myself to a learned and worthy clergyman of the church of England, who gave me the following answer: 'Archbishop Wake's objection to the repeal of the schism-act was founded on this consideration only, that such a repeal was needless, as no use had been made, or was likely to be made, of that act. It is also highly probable, that he would have consented without hesitation to rescind it, had nothing farther been endeavoured at the same time. But, considering what sort of spirit was then shown by the dissenters and others, it ought not to be a matter of great wonder, if he was afraid that, from the repeal of the other act (*viz.* that against occasional conformity), considerable damage might follow to the church over which he presided; and, even supposing his fears to be excessive, or quite groundless, yet certainly they were pardonable in a man who had never done, or designed to do, anything disagreeable to the dissenters in any other affair, and who, in this, had the concurrence of some of the greatest and wisest of the English lords, and of the earl of Ilay, among the Scotch, though a professed Presbyterian.'

However some may judge of this particular incident, I think it will appear, from the whole tenor of archbishop Wake's correspondence and transactions with

Christian churches of different denominations, that he was a man of a pacific, gentle, and benevolent spirit, and an enemy to the feuds, animosities, and party prejudices, which divide the professors of one holy religion, and by which Christianity is exposed to the assaults of its virulent enemies, and wounded in the house of its pretended friends. To this deserved eulogy we may add what a learned and worthy divine¹ has said of this eminent prelate, considered as a controversial writer, even 'that his accurate and superior knowledge of the nature of the Romish hierarchy, and of the constitution of the church of England, furnished him with victorious arms, both for the subversion of error and the defence of truth.'

AUTHENTIC COPIES OF THE ORIGINAL LETTERS, FROM WHICH
THE PRECEDING ACCOUNT IS DRAWN.

No. I.

A LETTER FROM ARCHBISHOP WAKE TO MR. BEAUVOIR.

Lambeth, Nov. 28, S. V., 1717.

I AM indebted to you for several kind letters, and some small tracts, which I have had the favour to receive from you. The last, which contains an account of the new edition that is going on of Chrysostome, I received yesterday. It will, no doubt, be a very valuable edition; but as they propose to go on with it, I shall hardly live to see it finished. They do not tell us to whom here we may go for subscriptions; and it is too much trouble to make returns to Paris. They should, for their own advantage, say where subscriptions will be taken in London, and where one may call for the several volumes as they come out, and pay for the next that are going on.

Among the account of books you were pleased to send me, there is one with a very promising title, *Thesaurus Anecdotorum*, five volumes. I wish I could know what the chief of those anecdotes are; it may be a book very well worth having. I admire they do not disperse some sheets of such works. What they can add to make Moreri's Dictionary so very voluminous, I cannot imagine. I bought it in two exorbitant volumes, and thought it big enough so. While I am writing this, company is come in, so that I am forced to break off; and I can only assure you, that upon all occasions, you shall find me very sincerely,

Reverend Sir,

Your faithful friend,

W. CANT.

N.B. This is the earliest letter in the whole collection; and, by the beginning of it, seems to be the first which the archbishop wrote to Mr. Beauvoir.

No. II.

A LETTER FROM MR. BEAUVOIR TO ARCHBISHOP WAKE.

Paris, Dec. 11, 1717, O. S.

MY LORD,

I HAD the honour of your grace's letter of the 28th ultimo, but Sunday last, and therefore could not answer it sooner. A person is to be appointed to receive subscriptions for the new edition of St. Chrysostome, and deliver the copies. Enclosed is an account of the *Thesaurus Anecdotorum*. Dr. Du-Pin, with whom I dined last Monday, and with the Syndic of the Sorbonne, and two other doctors, tells me,

¹ Dr. William Richardson, master of Emanuel College in Cambridge, and canon of Lincoln. See his noble edition, and his very elegant and judicious continuation of bishop Godwin's *Commentarius de Præsulibus Angliæ*, published in 1743, at Cambridge. His words

(p. 167) are: 'Nemo uspiam ecclesiæ Romanæ vel Anglicanæ statum penitus cognitum et exploratum habuit; et proinde in disputandi arenam prodit tum ad oppugnandum tum ad propugnandum instructissimus.'

that what swells Moreri's Dictionary are several additions, and particularly the families of Great Britain. He hath the chief hand in this new edition. They talked as if the whole kingdom was to appeal to the future general council, &c. They wished for an union with the church of England, as the most effectual means to unite all the western churches. Dr. Du-Pin desired me to give his duty to your grace, upon my telling him that I would send you an *arrêt* of the parliament of Paris relating to him, and a small tract of his. I have transmitted them to Mr. Prevèreau, at Mr. Secretary Addison's office.

No. III.

A LETTER FROM ARCHBISHOP WAKE TO MR. BEAUVOIR.

Aug. 30, 1718.

I TOLD you, in one of my last letters, how little I expected from the present pretences of an union with us. Since I received the papers you sent me, I am more convinced that I was not mistaken. My task is pretty hard, and I scarce know how to manage myself in this matter. To go any farther than I have done in it, even as a divine only of the church of England, may meet with censure; and, as archbishop of Canterbury, I cannot treat with these gentlemen. I do not think my character at all inferior to that of an archbishop of Paris; on the contrary, without lessening the authority and dignity of the church of England, I must say it is in some respects superior. If the cardinal were in earnest for such an union, it would not be below him to treat with me himself about it. I should then have a sufficient ground to consult with my brethren, and to ask his majesty's leave to correspond with him concerning it. But to go on any farther with these gentlemen, will only expose me to the censure of doing what, in my station, ought not to be done without the king's knowledge; and it would be very odd for me to have an authoritative permission to treat with those who have no manner of authority to treat with me. However, I shall venture at some answer or other to both their letters and papers, and so have done with this affair.

I cannot tell what to say to Dr. Du-Pin. If he thinks we are to take their direction what to retain, and what to give up, he is utterly mistaken. I am a friend to peace, but more to truth. And they may depend upon it, I shall always account our church to stand upon an equal foot with theirs; and that we are no more to receive laws from them, than we desire to impose any upon them. In short, the church of England is free, is orthodox: she has a plenary authority within herself, and has no need to recur to any other church to direct her what to retain or what to do. Nor will we, otherwise than in a brotherly way, and in a full equality of right and power, ever consent to have any treaty with that of France. And, therefore, if they mean to deal with us, they must lay down this for the foundation, that we are to deal with one another upon equal terms. If, consistently with our own establishment, we can agree upon a closer union with one another, well; if not, we are as much, and upon as good grounds, a free independent church as they are. And for myself, as archbishop of Canterbury, I have more power, larger privileges, and a greater authority than any of their archbishops; from which, by the grace of God, I will not depart—no, not for the sake of an union with them.

You see, sir, what my sense of this matter is; and may perhaps think that I have a little altered my mind since this affair was first set on foot. As to my desire of peace and union with all other Christian churches, I am still the same, but with the doctor's *Commonitorium* I shall never comply. The matter must be put into another method; and, whatever they think, they must alter some of their doctrines, and practices too, or an union with them can never be effected. Of this, as soon as I have a little more leisure, I shall write my mind as inoffensively as I can to them, but yet freely too.

If anything is to come of this matter, it will be the shortest method I can take of accomplishing it, to put them in the right way. If nothing (as I believe nothing will be done in it), it is good to leave them under a plain knowledge of what we think of ourselves and our church, and to let them see that we neither

need nor seek the union proposed, but for their sake as well as our own; or rather neither for theirs nor ours; but in order to the promotion of a catholic communion (as far as is possible) among all the true churches of Christ.

I have now plainly opened my mind to you; you will communicate no more of it than is fitting to the two doctors, but keep it as a testimony to my sincerity in this affair; and that I have no design but what is consistent with the honour and freedom of our English church, and with the security of that true and sound doctrine which is taught in it, and from which no consideration shall ever make me depart. I am,

Reverend Sir,

Your affectionate friend and brother,
W. CANT.

No. IV.

FROM ARCHBISHOP WAKE TO MR. BEAUVOIR.

Oct. 8, 1718.

WHATEVER be the consequence of our corresponding with the Sorbonne doctors about matters of religion, the present situation of our affairs plainly seems to make it necessary for us so to do. Under this apprehension, I have written, though with great difficulty, two letters to your two doctors, which I have sent to the secretary's office, to go with the next paquet to my lord Stair. I beg you to inquire after them; they made up together a pretty thick paquet, directed to you. In that to Dr. Du-Pin, I have, in answer to two of his MSS., described the method of making bishops in our church. I believe he will be equally both pleased and surprised with it. I wish you could show him the form of consecration, as it stands in the end of your large Common Prayer-books. The rest of my letters, both to him and Dr. Piers, is a venture, which I know not how they will take, to convince them of the necessity of embracing the present opportunity of breaking off from the pope, and going one step farther than they have yet done in their opinion of his authority, so as to leave him only a primacy of place and honour; and that merely by ecclesiastical authority, as he was once bishop of the imperial city. I hope they both show you my letters: they are at this time very long, and upon a nice point. I shall be very glad if you can any way learn how they take the freedom I have used, and what they really think of it. I cannot so much trust to their answers, in which they have more room to conceal their thoughts, and seldom want to overwhelm me with more compliments than I desire, or am well able to bear.

Pray do all you can to search out their real sense of, and motions at the receipt of, these two letters; I shall thereby be able the better to judge how far I may venture hereafter to offer anything to them upon the other points in difference between us; though, after all, I still think, if ever a reformation be made, it is the state that must govern the church in it. But this between ourselves.

No. V.

A LETTER FROM ARCHBISHOP WAKE TO DR. DU-PIN,
DATED OCTOBER 1, 1718.

Spectatissimo Viro, eruditorum suæ gentis, si non et sui sæculi, principi, Dno L. Ell. Du-Pin,
Doctori Parisiensi,

Gul. prov. Div. Cant. Archs. in omnibus εὐφρονεῖν καὶ εὐπράττειν.

DRU est, amplissime Domine, ex quo debitor tibi factus sum ob plures tractatus MSS. quos tuo beneficio a dilecto mihi in Christo D. Beauvoir accepi. Perlegi diligenter omnes, nec sine fructu; plurima quippe ab iis, cognitu dignissima, vel primum didici, vel clarius intellexi; beatamque his difficillimis temporibus censeo ecclesiam Gallicanam, quæ talem sibi in promptu habeat doctorem, in dubiis consiliarium, in juriis suis tuendis advocatum; qui et possit et audeat, non modo contra suos vel erroneos vel perfidos symmystas dignitatem ejus tueri, sed et ipsi

summo pontifici (ut olim B. Apostolus Paulus Petro) in faciem resistere, quia reprehensibilis est. Atque utinam hæc quæ Romæ aguntur, tandem aliquando omnibus vobis animum darent ad jura vestra penitus asserenda! Ut deinceps non ex pragmaticis (ut olim) sanctionibus, non (ut hoc fere tempore) ex concordatis, non ex præjudicatis hominum opinionibus, res vestras agatis: sed ea autoritate qua decet ecclesiam tam illustris ac præpotentis imperii; quæ nullo jure, vel divino, vel humano, alteri olim aut ecclesie aut homini subjicitur; sed ipsa jus habet intra se sua negotia terminandi, et in omnibus, sub rege suo Christianissimo, populum suum commissum propriis suis legibus et sanctionibus gubernandi.

Expergiscimini itaque, viri eruditi; et quod ratio postulat, nec refragatur religio, strenue agite. Hoc bonorum subditorum erga regem suum officium, Christianorum erga episcopos suos, heu! nimium extraneorum tyrannide oppressos, pietas exigit, flagitat, requirit. Excute tandem jugum istud, quod nec patres vestri, nec vos ferre potuistis. Illic ad reformationem, non pretensam, sed veram, sed justam, sed necessariam ecclesie nostræ, primus fuit gradus. Quæ Cæsaris erant, Cæsari reddidimus; quæ Dei, Deo. Coronæ imperiali regni nostri suum suprematum, episcopatu sui *āzlar*, ecclesie suam libertatem restituit, vel eo solum nomine semper cum honore memorandus, rex Henricus VIII. Hæc omnia sub pedibus conculcaverat idem ille tunc nobis, qui jam vobis inimicus. Sæpius autoritas papalis intra certos fines legibus nostris antea fuerat coercita; et iis quidem legibus, quas si quis hodie inspiceret, impossibile ei videretur eas potuisse, aliqua vel vi vel astutia, perumpere. Sed idem nobis accidit quod illis, qui demoniacum vinculis ligare volvere. Omnia frustra tentata; nihil perfecere inania legum repagula, contra nescio quos prætextus potestatis divinæ nullis humanis constitutionibus subditæ. Tandem defatigato regno dura necessitas sua jura tuendi oculos omnium aperuit. Proponitur questio episcopis ac clero in utriusque provincie synodo congregatis, an episcopus Romanus in sacris scripturis habeat aliquam majorem jurisdictionem in regno Angliæ quam quivis alius externus episcopus? In partem sanam, justam, veram, utriusque concilii suffragia concurrere. Quod episcopi cum suo clero statuerant, etiam regni academie calculo suo approbarunt, rex cum parlamento sancivit; adeoque tandem, quod unice fieri poterat, sublata penitus potestas, quam nullæ leges, nulla jura, vel civilia vel ecclesiastica, intra debitos fines unquam poterant continere. En nobis promptum ac paratum exemplum; quod sequi vobis gloriosum, nec minus posteris vestris utile fuerit! Quo solo pacem, absque veritatis spendio, tueri valeatis, ac irridere bruta de Vaticano fulmina, quæ jamdudum ostenditis vobis non ultra terrori esse, utpote a sacris scripturis edoctis, quod *maledictio absque causa prolata non superveniet*. Prov. xxvi. 2.

State ergo in libertate qua Christus vos donaverit. Frustra ad concilium generale nunquam convocandum res vestras refertis. Frustra decretorum vim suspendere curatis, quæ ab initio injusta, erronea, ac absurda, ac plane nulla erant. Non talibus subsidiis vobis opus est. Regia permissione, autoritate sua a Christo commissa, archiepiscopi et episcopi vestri in concilio nationale coeant: academiarum, cleri, ac præcipue utrorumque principis theologicæ facultatis Parisiensis, consilium atque auxilium sibi assumant: sic muniti quod æquum et justum fuerit decernant: quod decreverint etiam civili autoritate firmandum curent: nec patiantur factiosos homines alio res vestras vocare, aut ad judicem appellare qui nullam in vos autoritatem exposcere debeat, aut, si exposcat, merito a vobis recusari et poterit et debuerit.

Ignoscas, vir *πολυμαθισταρι*, indignationi dicam an amoris meo, si forte aliquanto ultra modum commoveri videar ab iis quæ vobis his proximis annis acciderint. Veritatem Christi omni qua possum animi devotione colo. Hanc vos tuemini: pro hac censuras pontificias subiistis, et porro ferre parati estis.

Ille, qui se pro summo ac fere unico Christi vicario venditat, veritatem ejus sub pedibus proterit, conculcat. Justitiam veneror: ac proinde vos injuste, ac plane tyrannice, si non oppressos, at petitos, at comminatos; at ideo solum non penitus obrutos, subversos, prostratos, quia Deus furori ejus obicem posuit, nec permiserit vos in ipsius manus incidere; non possum non vindicare, et contra violentum oppressorem, meum qualecunque suffragium ferre.

Jura ac libertates inclyti regni, celeberrimæ ecclesie, præstantissimi cleri cum

honore intueor. Hæc papa reprobatur, contemnit; et, dum sic alios tractat, merito se aliis castigandum, certe intra justos fines coercendum, exhibet. Siquid ei potestatis supra alios episcopos Christus commiserit, proferantur tabulæ; jus evincatur; cedere non recusamus.

Siquam prærogativam ecclesiæ concilia sedis imperialis episcopo concesserint (etsi cadente imperio, etiam ea prærogativa excidisse merito possit censi); tamen quod ad me attinet, servatis semper regnorum juribus, ecclesiarum libertatibus, episcoporum dignitate, modo in cæteris conveniatur, per me licet, suo fruatur, qualicumque primatu; non ego illi locum primum, non inanem honoris titulum invideo. At in alias ecclesias dominari; episcopatum, cujus partem Christus unicuique episcopo in solidum reliquit, tantum non in solidum sibi soli vindicare; si quis ejus injuste tyrannidi sese opposuerit, cælum ac terram in illius perniciem commovere; hæc nec nos unquam ferre potuimus, nec vos debetis. In hoc pacis fundamento si inter nos semel conveniatur, in cæteris aut idem sentiemus omnes, aut facile alii aliis dissentienti libertatem absque pacis jactura concedemus.

Sed abripit calamum meum nescio quis *Ενθουσιασμός*, dum de vestris injuriis nimium sum sollicitus; et forte liberius quam par esset de his rebus ad te scripsisse videbor.

Ego vero uti ea omnia, quæ tu in tuo *Commonitorio* exaraveris, etiam illa in quibus ab invicem dissentimus, grato animo accipio; ita ut aperte, ut candide et absque omni furo porro ad me scribere pergas, eaque *παρόησις* qua amicum cum amico agere deceat, imprimis a te peto; eo te mihi amiciorem fore existimans, quo simplicius, quo planius, quicquid censueris, libere dixeris.

Nec de *Commonitorio* tuo amplius aliquid hoc tempore reponam; in quo cum plurima placeant, tum id imprimis, quod etiam tuo iudicio, non adeo longe ab invicem distemus, quin si de fraterna unione ineunda publica aliquando auctoritate deliberari contigerit, via facile inveniri poterit ad pacem inter nos stabiliendam, salva utrinque ecclesiæ catholicæ fide ac veritate.

Quod ad alteros tuos tractatus de constitutione episcoporum in ecclesiis vacantibus, siquidem papa, legitime requisitus, facultates suas personis a rege nominatis obstinate pernegaverit; in iis sane reperio quod non tua eruditione et iudicio sit; quare, ne prorsus *ἀσύμβολος* discedam, ordinem tibi breviter delineabo constituendi episcopos in hac reformata nostra ecclesia.

Tu judicabis, an aliquid magis canonice vel excogitari vel statui poterit.

No. VI.

A LETTER FROM ARCHBISHOP WAKE TO DR. P. PIERS GIRARDIN,
WRITTEN IN OCTOBER, 1718.

Præstantissimo Viro, consummatissimo Theologo, Dno Patricio Piers de Girardin, Sacræ
Facultatis Parisiensis Theologiæ Doctori,

Gul. prov. Div. Cant. Archs. Gratiam, Pacem, ac Salutem in Domino.

Post prolixiores epistolas eruditissimo confratri tuo D^{no} Dri Du-Pin hoc ipso tempore exaratas; quasque ego paulo minus tuas quam illius existimari, velim; facilius a te veniam impetrabo, vir spectatissime, si aliquanto brevius ad te rescribam; et in illis quidem animi mei vel amoris vel indignationis libere indulti; eaque simplicitate, qua decet Christianum, et maxime episcopum, quid vobis, mea saltem sententia, factu opus sit, aperte exposui. Siquid, vel tuo vel illius iudicio, asperius quam par esset a me exciderit, cum vestri causa adeo commotus fuerim, facile id homini tam benevole erga vos animato, uti spero, condonabitur: unaque reminiscimini, nullam unquam vobis stabilem inter vos pacem, aut catholicam cum aliis unionem, haberi posse, dum aliquid ultra merum honoris primatum ac *προεδρίαν* pontifici Romano tribuitis. Hoc nos per aliquot secula experti sumus; vos jam sentire debetis, qui, nescio quo insano ipsius beneficio, adeo commodam occasionem nacti estis, non tam ab illius decretis appellandi, quam ab ipsius dominio ac potestate vos penitus subducendi. Ipse vos pro schismaticis habet; qualem vos eum censere debetis? Ipse a vestra communione se suosque separandos publice denunciat. Quid vobis in hoc casu faciendum? Liceat mihi veteris illius Cæsareæ

episcopi Firmiliani verbis respondere; sic olim Stephanum papam acriter quidem, sed non ideo minus juste, castigavit: *Vide qua imperitia reprehendere audeas eos qui contra mendacium pro veritate nituntur. Peccatum vero quam magnum tibi exaggerasti, quando te a tot gregibus scidisti: excidisti enim te ipsum, noli te fallere; siquidem ille est vere schismaticus qui se a communione ecclesiastica unitatis apostatam fecerit. Dum enim putas omnes a te abstinere posse, solum te ab omnibus abstinuisti.* Cyr. Op. Epist. 75.

Agite ergo, viri eruditi, et quo vos divina providentia vocat, libenter sequimini. Clemens papa vos abdicavit: a sua et suorum communione repulit, rejecit. Vos illius autoritatis renunciate. Cathedræ Petri, quæ in omnibus catholicis ecclesiis conservatur, adhærete; etiam nostram ne refugiatis communionem; quibuscum si non in omnibus omnino doctrinæ Christianæ capitibus conveniatis, at in præcipuis, at in fundamentalibus, at in omnibus articulis fidei ad salutem necessariis plane consentitis; etiam in cæteris, uti speramus, brevi consensuri. Nobis certe eo minus vos vel hæreticos vel schismaticos fore confidite, quod a papa ejecti pro hæreticis et schismaticis Romæ æstimemini. Sed contrahenda vela, nec indulgendum huic meo pro vobis zelo, etsi sit secundum scientiam. Prudentibus loquor; vos ipsi, quod dico, judicate.

Ad literas tuas, præstantissime Domine, redeo; in quibus uti tuum de mediocritate mea iudicium, magis ex affectu erga me tuo, quam secundum merita mea prolatum, gratanter accipio, ita in eo te nunquam falli patiar, quod me pacis ecclesiasticæ amantissimum credas, omniaque illi consequendæ danda putem, præter veritatem. Quantum ad illam promovendam tu jamjam contuleris, ex sex illis propositionibus quas tuis inseruisti literis, gratus agnosco; ac nisi ambitiose magis quam hominem privatum deceat, me facturum existimarem, etiam eruditissimis illis confratribus tuis doctoribus Sorbonicis, quibus priores meas literas communicasti, easdem per te gratias referrem. Sane facultas vestra Parisiensis, uti maximum in his rebus pondus merito habere debeat, sive numerum, sive dignitatem, sive denique eruditionem suorum membrorum spectemus: ita a vobis exordium sumere debebit unio illa inter nos tantopere desiderata, siquidem eam aliquando iniuri voluerit Deus.

Interim gratulor vobis post illustrissimum card. Noaillium, alterum illum ecclesiæ Gallicanæ, fidei catholicæ, columnam et ornamentum, procuratorem regium D. D. Joly de Fleury; quem virum ego non jam primum ex tuis literis debito prosequi honore didici, verum etiam ob ea quæ vestri causa his proximis annis publice egerit, antea suspicere, et pene venerari, consueveram. Sub his ducibus, quid non sperandum in publicum vestrum ac catholicæ ecclesiæ commodum? Intonet de Vaticano pontifex Romanus: freinant inter vos ipsos conjurata turba, Romanæ curiæ servi magis quam suæ Galliæ fideles subditi. His præsidis ab eorum injuriis tuti, vanas eorum iras contemnere valeatis.

Ego vero, uti omnia vobis publice fausta ac felicia precor, ita tibi, spectatissime vir, me semper addictissimum fore promitto. De quo quicquid alias senseris, id saltem ut de me credas jure postulo; me sincere veritatem Christi et amare et quærere, et, nisi omnino me fallat animus, etiam assecutum esse. Nulli Christiano inimicus antehac aut fui aut deinceps sum futurus; sic de erroribus eorum, qui a me dissident, judico, ut semper errantes Deo judicandos relinquam. Homo sum, errare possum; sic vero animatus audacter dicam, hæreticus esse nolo. Te vero, siquidem id permittas, fratrem; sin id minus placeat, saltem id indulgebis, ut me vere et ex animo profitear, excellentissime Domine, tui amantissimum.

W. C.

No. VII.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM ARCHBISHOP WAKE TO MR. BEAUVOIR.

Nov. 6, O.S., 1718.

YOUR last letter gives me some trouble, but more curiosity. I little thought, when I wrote to your two doctors, that my letters should have been read, much less copies of them given to any such great persons as you mention. I write in haste, as you know, and trust no amanuensis to copy for me, because I will not be liable to be betrayed. And upon a review of my foul, and only copy of them,

since I had your account from Paris, I find some things might have been more accurately expressed, had I taken more time to correct my style. But I wish that may be the worst exception against them: I fear the freedom I took in exhorting them to do somewhat in earnest, upon so fair a provocation with regard to the papal authority, though excused as well as I could, will hardly go down so effectually as I could wish with them. This raises my curiosity to know truly and expressly how that part of my letters operated on both your doctors; which, by a wary observation, you may in good measure gather from their discourse. I cannot tell whether they showed my letters to you; if they did, I am sure you will think I did not mince the matter with them in that particular.

Of your two doctors, Dr. Piers seems the more polite: he writes elegantly both for style and matter, and has the free air, even as to the business of an union. Yet I do not despair of Dr. Du-Pin, whom, thirty years ago, in his collection of tracts relating to church discipline, I did not think far from the kingdom of God.

No. VIII.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM ARCHBISHOP WAKE TO MR. BEAUVOIR.

Nov. 18, 1718.

At present, my more particular curiosity leads me to know the sentiments of the leading men in France with regard to the court of Rome; from which, if we could once divide the Gallican church, a reformation in other matters would follow of course. The scheme that seems to me most likely to prevail, is, to agree in the independence (as to all matters of authority) of every national church on any others; and in their right to determine all matters that arise within themselves; and, for points of doctrine, to agree, as far as possible, in all articles of any moment (as in effect we either already do, or easily may); and for other matters, to allow a difference, till God shall bring us to an union in those also. One only thing should be provided for, to purge out of the public offices of the church such things as hinder a perfect communion in the service of the church, that so, whenever any one come from us to them, or from them to us, we may all join together in prayers and the holy sacraments with each other. In our liturgy there is nothing but what they allow, save the single rubric relating to the eucharist; in theirs nothing but what they agree may be laid aside, and yet the public offices be never the worse or more imperfect for want of it. Such a scheme as this I take to be a more proper ground of peace, at the beginning, than to go to more particulars; if in such a foundation we could once agree, the rest would be more easily built upon it. If you find occasion, and that it may be of use, you may extract this object, and offer it to their consideration, as what you take to be my sense in the beginning of a treaty; not that I think we shall stop here, but that, being thus far agreed, we shall the more easily go into a greater perfection hereafter. I desire you to observe, as much as you can, when it is I may the most properly write to the doctors. I took the subject of the pope's authority in my last, as arising naturally from the present state of their affairs, and as the first thing to be settled in order to an union. How my freedom in that respect has been received, I desire you freely to communicate.

No. IX.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM ARCHBISHOP WAKE TO MR. BEAUVOIR.

Dec. 2, O. S., 1718.

I AM glad the two doctors seem to receive my last letters so well. The truth is, that while they manage as they do with the court of Rome, nothing will be done to any purpose: and all ends in trifling at the last. We honestly deny the pope all authority over us: they pretend, in words, to allow him so much as is consistent with what they call their Gallican privileges; but let him ever so little use it contrary to their good liking, they protest against it, appeal to a general council, and then mind him as little as we can do. In earnest, I think we treat

his holiness not only with more sincerity, but more respect than they; for, to own a power, and yet keep a reserve to obey that power only so far, and in such cases as we may make ourselves judges of, is a greater affront than honestly to confess that we deny the power, and, for that reason, refuse to obey it. But my design was partly to bring them to this, and partly to see how they would bear at least the proposal of totally breaking off from the court and bishop of Rome.

What you can observe or discover more of their inclinations in this particular will be of good use, especially if it could be found out what the court would do, and how far that may be likely to countenance the clergy in such a separation. In the mean time, it cannot be amiss to cultivate a friendship with the leading men of that side, who may in time be made use of to the good work of reforming in earnest the Gallican church. I am a little unhappy that I have none here I yet dare trust with what I do; though I am satisfied most of our high-church bishops and clergy would readily come into such a design. But these are not men either to be confided in, or made use of, by

Your assured friend,

W. CANT.

P.S.—Did cardinal de Noailles know what authority the archbishop of Canterbury has gotten by the reformation, and how much a greater man he is now than when he was the pope's *legatus natus*, it might encourage him to follow so good a pattern; and be assured (in that case), he would lose nothing by sending back his cardinal's cap to Rome. I doubt your doctors know little of these matters.

No. X.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM ARCHBISHOP WAKE TO MR. BEAUVOIR.

Jan. 23, O.S., 1718.

WHEN you see my letter (for I conclude the doctor will show it you), you may do well to bring on the discourse of our episcopal rights and privileges in England, and particularly of the prerogatives of the archbishop of Canterbury, which, I believe, are greater than those of the archbishop of Rheims, or of all the archbishops in France. This may raise in them a curiosity to know more of this matter, which, if they desire, I will take the first little leisure I have to give them a more particular account of it. We must deal with men in their own way, if we mean to do any good with them. They have been used to a pompous ministry, and, like the Jews heretofore, would despise the Messiah himself if he should come in a poor and low estate to them. And, therefore, though, for myself, I account all temporal grandeur as nothing, and am afraid it has rather hurt the church of Christ, and the true spirit of piety and religion, than done any real service to either, yet it may be the means of disposing these gentlemen to a more favourable thought of, and inclination towards, a reformation; to convince them that they may return to the truth of Christianity, and leave the corruptions of Rome, without losing any honour, any power, that a servant of Christ would desire to be troubled withal. Had the first reformers in France yielded to this scheme, as we in England showed them an example, the whole Gallican church had come in to them, and been at this day as we are now: we must therefore hit off the blot which they made, and satisfy their ambition so far as to show them that they may reform, without giving up either their authority or revenues, and be still as great, but much better, bishops, under our circumstances than under their own.

As to the pope's authority, I take the difference to be only this: that we may all agree (without troubling ourselves with the reason) to allow him a primacy of order in the episcopal college. They would have it thought necessary to hold communion with him, and allow him a little canonical authority over them, as long as he will leave them to prescribe the bounds of it. We fairly say we know of no authority he has in our realm; but for actual submission to him, they as little mind it as we do.

At present he has put them out of his communion; we have withdrawn ourselves from his; both are out of communion with him, and I think it is not material on which side the breach lies.

No. XI.

A LETTER FROM ARCHBISHOP WAKE TO MR. BEAUVOIR.

Feb. 5, 1718-19, O.S.

I do not doubt that mine of the 18th of January, with the two enclosed for my lord Stair and Dr. Du-Pin, are before this come safe to you. I should not be sorry if, upon this late transaction between the doctor and ministry, you have kept it in your hands, and not delivered it to him. I had just begun a letter to Dr. Piers, but have thrown aside what I writ of it, since I received your last; and must beg the favour of you to make my excuse to him, with the tenders of my hearty service, till I see a little more what the meaning of this present inquisition is. I am not so unacquainted with the finesses of courts, as not to apprehend, that what is now done may be as well in favour of the doctor's attempt as against it. If the *procureur-général* be indeed well affected to it, he might take this method, not only to his own security, but to bring the affair under a deliberation, and give a handle to those whom it chiefly concerns to discover their sentiments of it. But the matter may be also put to another use, and nobody can answer that it shall not be so: and till I see what is the meaning of this sudden turn, I shall write no more letters for the French ministry to examine, but content myself to have done enough already to men who cannot keep their own counsel, and live in a country where even the private correspondence of learned men with one another must be brought to a public inquiry, and be made the subject of a state inquisition. I am not aware, that in any of my letters there is one line that can give a just offence to the court. I always took it for granted, that no step should be taken towards an union, but with the knowledge and approbation, and even by the authority, of civil powers; and indeed, if I am in the right, that nothing can be done to any purpose in this case but by throwing off the pope's authority, as the first step to be made in order to it, it is impossible for any such attempt to be made by any power less than the king's. All, therefore, that has passed hitherto, stands clear of any just exception as to the civil magistrate; it is only a consultation in order to find out a way how an union might be made, if a fit occasion should hereafter be offered for the doing of it. Yet still I do not like to have my letters exposed in such a manner, though satisfied there is nothing to be excepted against in them; and think I shall be kind to the doctors themselves, to suspend, at least for a while, my further troubling of them. I hope you will endeavour, by some or other of your friends, to find out the meaning of this motion; from whom it came; how far it has gone; what was the occasion of it; and what is like to be the consequence of it; what the abbé du Bois says of my letters, and how they are received by him and the other ministers. I shall soon discover whether any notice has been taken of it to our ministry: and I should think, if the abbé spoke to your lord about it, he would acquaint you with it.

No. XII.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM ARCHBISHOP WAKE TO MR. BEAUVOIR.

Feb. 24, 1718.

I do not at all wonder that the cardinals Rohan and Bissi should do all they can to blacken the good cardinal de Noailles, and in him the party of the anti-constitutionists, but especially the Sorbonne, their most weighty and learned adversaries; and I am sensible that such a complaint is not only the most proper to do this, but to put the court itself under some difficulties, which way soever it acts upon it. But I am still the more curious to learn, if it were possible, not only the proceedings of the ministry above board hereupon, but their private thoughts and opinions about it. I am under no concern upon my own account, further than that I would be unwilling to have my letters scanned by so many great men, which will scarcely bear the judgment of my very friends. You must do me the favour to get out of your doctors what will be most obliging to them, whether to continue to write to them, or to be silent for a while, till we see what will be

the effect of this inquiry. In the mean time, it grows every day plainer what I said from the beginning, that no reformation can be made but by the authority and with the concurrence of the court; and that all we divines have to do is, to use our interest to gain them to it, and to have a plan ready to offer to them, if they would be prevailed upon to come into it.

I am at present engaged in two or three other transactions of moment to the foreign protestants, which take up abundance of my time; God knows what will be the effect of it. Nevertheless, if I can in any way help to promote this, though I am at present without any help, alone, in this project, I shall do my utmost, both to keep up my poor little interest with the two doctors and their friends, and to concert proper methods with them about it. The surest way will be to begin as well, and to go as far as we can, in settling a friendly correspondence one with another; to agree to own each other as true brethren, and members of the catholic Christian church; to agree to communicate in everything we can with one another (which, on their side, is very easy, there being nothing in our offices, in any degree, contrary to their own principles); and would they purge out of theirs what is contrary to ours, we might join in the public service with them, and yet leave one another in the free liberty of believing transubstantiation or not, so long as we did not require anything to be done by either in pursuance of that opinion. The Lutherans do this very thing; many of them communicate not only in prayers, but in the communion, with us; and we never inquire whether they believe consubstantiation, or even pay any worship to Christ as present with the elements, so long as their outward actions are the same with our own, and they give no offence to any with their opinions.

P.S. Since this last accident, and the public noise of an union at Paris, I have spoken something more of it to my friends here, who, I begin to hope, will fall in with it. I own a correspondence, but say not a tittle how far, or in what way, I have proceeded, more than that letters have passed, which can no longer be a secret. I have never shown one of my own or the doctors' to anybody.

No. XIII.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM ARCHBISHOP WAKE TO MR. BEAUVOIR.

March 16, S. V., 1718.

I THANK you for your account of what passed between Mons. Hop and you, relating to the project of an union: I doubt that gentleman will not be pleased with it, because, indeed, the Gallican church will never unite with any church that has not an orderly episcopacy in it. I am very sorry my poor letters are made so public. The next thing will be, that either the imprudence of our friends, or the malice of our enemies, will print them; and then I shall have censures enough for them, perhaps some reflections printed upon them, or answers made to them; but this shall not engage me in any defence of them, or in taking any further notice of them. I beg you to keep those I have written to yourself from all view; for I have no copies of them, and I wrote them as I do my other ordinary letters, without any great thought or consideration, more than what my subject (as I was writing) led me in that instant to. This is the liberty to be taken with a friend, where one is sure what he writes shall go no further; but for the same reason, will require the strictest suppression from any other view. I cannot yet guess what this turn means, nor how it will end; I wish your doctors could give you some further light into it.

P.S. I entreat you never to forget me to the two good doctors, whom I love and honour: keep up the little interest I have with them. As soon as ever the present turn is over, I will write to Dr. Girardin. I hope my letters will not always be carried as criminals before the secretary of state, though I am persuaded he bears no ill-will to me.

No. XIV.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM ARCHBISHOP WAKE TO MR. BEAUVOIR.

April 29, 1719.

I AM much concerned to hear that Dr. Du-Pin decays so fast: I feared by his last letter that he was sinking apace. Pray, is there any good print of him taken these last years? for I have one that was made when he was a young man. I am sorry Dr. Piers grows faint-hearted: I never thought anything could be done as to a reformation in France, without the authority of the court: but I was in hopes the regent and others might have found their account in such an attempt; and then the good disposition of the bishops, clergy, and Sorbonne, with the parliament of Paris, would have given a great deal of spirit and expedition to it. I have done what was proper for me in that matter: I can now go no further, till the abbot Du Bois is better disposed; yet I shall still be pleased to keep up a little esteem between those gentlemen, which will do *us* some good, if it does not do *them* any service. I am apt to think the good old man (Du-Pin) does not think us far from the kingdom of heaven. I have with this sent a letter of friendship to Dr. Piers, which you will be so kind as to send him, with my kind respects.

No. XV.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM ARCHBISHOP WAKE TO DR. DU-PIN, DATED LAMBETH, MAY 1, 1719.

N.B. Du-Pin was dead before it arrived at Paris.

SPERAVERAM equidem tua auctoritate, constantia, eruditione, pietate, moderatione, quæ omnia adeo in te perfecta esse noscuntur, ut vix in aliis singula, præclari aliquid ad Dei gloriam, ecclesiæque Gallicanæ utilitatem, perfici potuisse. Crediderim advenisse tempus, in quo, excusso Romanæ tyrannidis jugo, una nobiscum in eandem communionem coalesceretis. In dogmatibus, prout a te candide proponuntur, non admodum dissentimus: in regimine ecclesiastico minus: in fundamentalibus, sive doctrinam sive disciplinam spectemus, vix omnino. Quam facilis erat ab his initiis ad concordiam progressus, modo animos haberemus ad pacem compositos! Sed hoc principibus sæculi non aridet, unionis inimicis etiam plurimum displicet: neque nobis forte dabit Deus esse tam felicibus, ut ad hujusmodi unionem nostram qualemcunque operam conferamus. Relinquamus hoc Illi, in Cujus manu sunt rerum omnium tempora et occasiones. Sufficiat voluisse aliquid in tam insigni opere, forte et semina in terram projecisse, quæ fructum tandem multiplicem proferant. Interim, quod nemo nobis denegare possit, nos invicem ut fratres, ut ejusdem mystici corporis membra, amplectamur.

No. XVI.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM ARCHBISHOP WAKE TO MR. BEAUVOIR.

Feb. 9, S. V., 1719-20.

I HEARTILY wish there were either spirit or inclination enough in the Sorbonne to go on with our friend the abbe's project; but the fire decays, men's inclinations cool: the court will do nothing, and you are very sensible that, without the court, nothing can be done in any such affair. Nevertheless, their good opinion of the church of England should be kept up as much as possible; we should encourage them all we can to account of us as brethren, who have only thrown off what they are weary of—the tyranny of the court of Rome, without any change in any fundamental article, either of the doctrine or government of the catholic church; and upon this ground I shall be ready to continue a brotherly correspondence with any of their great men, provided it be done with such caution as may not expose my letters to be made prisoners to a secretary of state—a thing which can never become my character, and may carry an ill aspect, even in our own court, till the thing be rightly understood.

No. XVII.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM THE ARCHBISHOP TO MR. BEAUVOIR.

March 31, 1720.

I THANK you for your account of the present state of the French church. It is a very odd one indeed, but will settle into an agreement at last. When once the appellants begin to break, the court will drive all the *obstinate* (as they will call them; I should name them, the *honest* men of courage and constancy) to a compliance.

No. XVIII.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM THE ARCHBISHOP TO MR. BEAUVOIR.

April 19, O. S., 1720.

I PERCEIVE, by some late letters from him (Piers Girardin), that he begins to despair of the business of the constitution. He has reason: the cardinal de Noailles is ensnared, and has gone too far to retire. The new archbishop of Cambray will be a cardinal; and this affair of the constitution must procure the *calot* for him. The regent himself is afraid of the Spanish party and the Jesuits; and he will gain, or at least appease them. For all these reasons, the doctrine of the church, and the Gallican liberties, must be abandoned; and, on the slight pretence of a comment of no esteem with the opposite party, an accommodation will certainly be made; and those who will not voluntarily go, shall be driven into it. If our poor friend be one of those who must hereby suffer, why may he not consider of a retreat hither, and, since he cannot yet bring on an union with the two churches, unite himself with ours, from which I am sure his principles, and I believe his inclinations, are not greatly distant? But this must be managed very tenderly, and rather by a kind of rallying, than a direct proposal of it. If he inclines to it, he will easily understand your meaning; if not, it is best not to go on far with him in a matter in which you will have no good success.

No. XIX.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM ARCHBISHOP WAKE TO MR. LE CLERC.

April, 1719.

NOVUM Testamentum Gallicum, notis tuis feliciter ornatum, totum, nec sine fructu, perlegi. Prefatione tua eidem præfixa mirifice affectus sum; legi, relegi, quin et sæpius deinceps repetam. Ita me in ipso præsertim ejus initio commovit, ut verè pietatis in ea relucentem spiritum nunquam satis laudare possim, vel animo meo satis alte imprimere.

Et quanvis in annotationibus tuis quædam liberius dicta occurrant, quæ non æque omnibus placeant, neque mihi ipsi ubique satisfaciant; fero tamen, et vel in ipso tuo a communi sententia discessu aliquid mihi invenire videor, quod ignoscere magis quam acerbius reprehendere debeam, multo minus inclementius damnare. Libertatem prophetandi, modo pia ac sobria sit, cum charitate ac mansuetudine conjuncta, nec contra analogiam *fidei semel sanctis tradita*, adeo non vituperandam, ut etiam probandam censeam. De rebus adiaphoris cum nemine contendendum puto. Ecclesias reformatas, etsi in aliquibus a nostra Anglicana dissentientes, libenter amplector. Optarem equidem regimen episcopale bene temperatum, et ab omni injusta dominatione sejunctum, quale apud nos obtinet, et, siquid ego in his rebus sapiam, ab ipso apostolorum ævo in ecclesia receptum fuerit, et ab iis omnibus fuisset retentum; nec despero quin aliquando restitutum, si non ipse videam, at posterì videbunt. Interim absit ut ego tam ferrei pectoris sim, ut ob ejusmodi defectum (sic mihi absque omni invidia appellare liceat) aliquas earum a communione nostra abscindendas credam; aut, cum quibusdam furiosis inter nos Scriptoribus, eas nulla vera ac valida sacramenta habere, adeoque vix Christianos esse pronuntiem. Unionem arctiorem inter omnes reformatos procurare quovis

pretio vellem. Hæc si in regimine ecclesiastico ac publicis ecclesiarum officiis obtineri potuit; aut ego plurimum fallor, aut id solum brevi conduceret ad animum inter eos unionem conciliandam, et viam sterneret ad plenam in omnibus nostræ securitatem conduceret; quantum etiam ad pseudo-catholicorum Romanensium conversionem, cæcus sit qui non videat.—Sed abripuit me longius quam par esset hæc semper mihi dulcis de pace ac unionem ecclesiarum reformatarum cogitatio,—&c.

No. XX.

ARCHBISHOP WAKE'S LETTER TO THE PASTORS AND PROFESSORS OF GENEVA.

April 8, 1719.

QUAMVIS literis vestris nihil mihi gratius potuit afferri, non tamen absque summo dolore, vix oculis siccis, eas perlegi; neque credo quenquam esse tam ferrei pectoris, qui ad ea mala quæ in illis referuntur non perhorrescat, mireturque talia ab hominibus erga homines, a popularibus erga populares suos, a Christianis denique erga Christianos, idque (quod fidem omnem exuperare valeat) etiam religionis causa, fieri et perpetrari.

Vos interim, venerandi viri, quod vestri erat officii, sedulo præstitistis. Delegatos ecclesiarum Hungaricarum amice accepistis. Querimoniam eorum, ea qua par erat charitate atque sympathia fraterna audivistis; nullaque mora adhibita, ad remedium malis ipsorum inveniendum omnes vestras cogitationes convertistis. Perillustres magistratus vestros, cæteros reformatæ religionis principes atque senatores, ad persecutiones horum fratrum vestrorum serio considerandas, excitavistis, et ut suam auctoritatem interponerent ad sedandas eorum oppressiones enixissime obsecrastis.

Denique, nequid vel minimi ponderis desideretur quo studium vestrum in hoc tam insigni charitatis opere exequendo ostendatis, etiam mea qualicunque opera uti voluistis, ad animum augustissimi regis nostri commovendum, ne in hac tam gravi sua necessitate afflictis Christi servis deesset.

O amorem vere Christianum! et qualem deceat ejusdem corporis membra erga se invicem habere! Dignum profecto et vobis, et eximio illo vestro congressu, opus: ut quo præcipue tempore convenistis ad laudes Dei celebrandas, qui per duo jam secula religionem reformatam vobis incolumem servaverit, eodem etiam illam ipsam religionem evangelicam in aliis regionibus oppressam, concussam, ac tantum non extremum quasi spiritum trahentem, sublevetis et, si fieri possit, in integrum restituat.

Ego vero, fratres charissimi, et propria voluntate motus, et vestro tam illustri exemplo impulsus, adeo eodem vobiscum ardore accendor, ut nihil non tentandum putem, quo vestris tam piis, tam justis, tamque benignis conatibus optatum successum comparem.

Imprimis igitur nobilem virum comitem Sunderlandiæ primarium regis ministrum sedulo adivi: literas vestras illi communicavi; petii, oravi, ut in hac re suam mihi operam atque auxilium concedere vellet; utque simul regiam majestatem adirem; non quod de ipsius prompta voluntate dubitarem, sed ut quæ in hac causa facienda essent, eo majori vigore atque promptitudine perficerentur. Successit, fere ultra spem, conatus noster. Utriusque ecclesiæ tum Hungariæ tum vicinæ Vallensis, oppressiones regi, eo quo par erat affectu, exposuimus. Favorem ejus atque auctoritatem apud Cæsarem regemque Sardinie obnixè imploravimus, ut ab his tam injustis vexationibus, eorum jussu et mandatis, liberentur. Et præcipue quod ad Pedemontanas ecclesias attinet, etiam adhortati sumus, ut jure suo a rege Sardinie postularet, ut pacta in his quæ religionis exercitium concernent, earum gratia inita, meliori fide in posterum observentur. Annuit votis nostris rex serenissimus; neque dubito quin legatis suis jamdudum præceperit, ut omnem quam possunt operam suo nomine impendant, quo ab istis adeo iniquis oppressionibus utriusque ecclesiæ membra liberentur. Orandus Deus ut tanti principis conatibus, in hac tam justa, tam pia, tam religioni Christianæ proficua interpellatione, aspirare dignetur, et oppressis suis servis exoptatam requiem tandem concedere, pro immensa sua misericordia, velit.

Interim, dum hæc feliciter, uti spero, peraguntur, ignoscite, fratres dilectissimi, si majoris quidem laboris atque difficultatis, sed longe maximi omnibus commodi, inceptum vobis proponam: in quo et sæpe alias et hoc tempore complures primariae dignitatis viri summo studio allaborant; et quod ab omnibus, quibus puritas Evangelii reipsa cordi sit, una secum allaborandum sperant. Jamdudum sentitis quo mea tendit adhortatio; ad unionem nimirum inter omnes quæ ubique sunt ecclesias, quæ his ultimis seculis a communione, seu verius tyrannide pontificis Romani, sese subdlexerunt, sedulo promovendam. Quin hoc fieri possit, si quidem animum ad concordiam promptum omnes attulerimus, nullatenus dubitandum est: quin fieri debeat, nemo prudens negaverit, &c. &c.

Vos interim, F. C., hoc agite, ut saltem inter vos ipsos pax atque concordia inviolabiliter conserventur. Summo quippe dolore, anno præterito, accepi dissensiones inter vos ortas fuisse, de capitulis aliquot circa doctrinam de gratia universalis, aliisque quæstionibus longe difficillimis, in quibus optimi viri et doctissimi theologi idem per omnia haudquaquam sentiunt. Angit hoc sane, idque non mediocriter, animum meum. Et quamvis nollem vobis videri ἀλλοτριεπισκοπεῖν, aut *in alienum* (quod aiunt) *messem, falcem meum immittere*; permittite tamen ut in spiritu charitatis, eoque quo erga vos feror amore fraterno, vos obsecrem, et in Domino obtester, ut in hujusmodi rebus, quatenus id fieri possit, idem sentiat omnes; quod si id non assequi valeatis, ut saltem sic alii alios feratis, ut nullum sit inter vos schisma, nullus querimoniarum aliquorum adversus alios locus; ut non nimium curiosi sitis in iis determinandis quæ Deus non admodum clare revelaverit, quæque absque salutis dispendio tuto nesciri poterint; quæ sapientissimi prædecessores nostri in omnibus suis confessionibus caute tractanda censuerunt, eaque moderatione, ut universi in iis subscribendis consentirent; et a quorum prudenti cautela sicubi postea discessum fuerit, contentiones, lites, inimicitiae, aliaque infinita incommoda, protinus subsecuta sunt.

In his disquisitionibus Lutherani a reformatis dissident; nec reformati ipsi prorsus inter se conveniunt. Ecclesia Anglicana optimo consilio, exemplo ab omnibus imitando, nullius conscientiae, his in rebus, jugum imponit. Quæ de illis in articulis suis statuerit, talia sunt, ut ab omnibus ex æquo admittantur. His contenta, nec ipsa aliquid amplius requirit curiosius statuere. Hinc summa inter nos pax cum sobria sentiendi libertate conjuncta. Utinam et vobis, iisdem conditionibus, concordia stabiliatur, utque veteri confessione vestra Helvetica contenti, neque alicui permitteretis aliter docere, neque ab aliquo quidpiam profitendum requireretis, ultra id quod ab initio requisitum fuerit: cum tamen summi illi viri Calvinus et Beza (ut de aliis taceatur) secus de his articulis sentirent, quam alii plures; quos tamen non solum tolerandos, sed et pro fratribus habendos rite ac sapienter judicarunt.

Hoc vobis non modo pacem inter vos ipsos conciliabit, verum etiam concordiam cum aliis ecclesiis reformatis sartam tectam tuebitur. Absque hujusmodi temperamine, unio illa cum Protestantibus, tantopere desiderata, nullo modo iniri poterit: vos, igitur, serio hæc, ut par est, considerate: nec a nobis, a plerisque aliis reformatis, etiam a vestris antecessoribus, novis ac durioribus impositionibus secedite, &c.

N.B. The former part of this letter, which relates to the intercession of archbishop Wake in behalf of the Hungarian and Piedmontese churches, has never been hitherto published. The latter part, beginning with these words, 'Interim dum hæc feliciter peraguntur, ignoscite,' &c., was inserted, by Professor Turretin of Geneva, in his work entitled *Nubes Testium*. The words 'Interim dum hæc,' &c., were, from an ignorance of their connexion with what goes before, supposed by some learned men to relate to the projected union between the English and Gallican churches; and Kierning, who says in his *Dissertation de Consecrationibus Episcoporum Anglorum*, that Dr. Wake communicated this project to the divines of Geneva, fell into this mistake, and probably drew Dr. Mosheim after him.

No. XXI.

EXTRACT FROM ARCHBISHOP WAKE'S LETTER TO PROFESSOR SCHURER, OF BERN,
JULY, 1718.

DE Anglia nostra te peramanter et sentire et scribere plurimum gaudeo. Quam enim non adeo cæcus sim patriæ meæ amator, ut non plurima hic videam quæ vel penitus sublata vel in melius mutata quovis pretio vellem, tamen aliqua etiam in hac temporum fæce occurrere, optimis etiam seculis digna, et quæ ipsa primæva ecclesia Christiana probare, ne dicam et laudare, potuisset, et tu æquissime agnoscis et nos nobis gratulamur.

No. XXII.

TO PROFESSOR TURRETIN, JULY, 1718.

Speaking of Bishop Davenant's opinion as agreeable to his own.

UTINAM sic sentiremus omnes, et fundamentalibus religionis articulis semper salvis, nihil ultra ab aliquo subscribendum requireremus, quod bonorum hominum conscientii oneri esse potest, certe ecclesiæ utilitatem parum promovebit.—Ut enim de hac ecclesiarum reformatarum utilitate paucis dicam; primum earum stabilimentum in hoc consistere, ut omnes sese, quantum fieri possit, contra papalem potentiam ac tyrannidem tueantur, nemini credo dubium esse posse. Ut in hunc finem quam arctissime inter se uniantur, et in idem corpus coalescant, adeo ut siquid alicui ex iis ecclesiæ damni aut detrimenti a communi hoste fuerit illatum, id ab omnibus tanquam suum haberetur, concedi etiam necesse est.

Ut denique pax et concordia cujuslibet ecclesiæ reformatæ inter suos, ac cum aliis omnibus ejusmodi ecclesiis conserventur; unicuique viro bono, sed præsertim ecclesiarum illarum magistratibus atque ministris, totis viribus enitendum esse, adeo clare apparet, ut nulla probatione firmiori indigeat.

Afterwards :

Quid in hac re aliud faciendum restat, nisi ut tua et amicorum tuorum auctoritate primo facultas vestra theologica, magistratus, ministri, cives Genevenses, deinde eorum exemplo atque hortatu reliqua etiam fœderis Helvetici membra reformatæ, omnem lapidem moveant, ut pacem ecclesiis Bernensibus restituant? Neque id ego sic fieri vellem, ut non simul et religionis veritati et doctrinæ puritati consulatur. Subscribant ministri, professores, theologi, confessioni vestræ veteri anno¹ [] editæ: prohibeantur, sub quavislibet pœna, ne ullam in concionibus, scriptis, thesibus, prælectionibus, sententiam publice tueantur illi confessioni quovis modo contrariam. Id solum caveatur, ne multiplicentur hujusmodi subscriptiones absque necessitate: neque stricte nimis inquiretur in privatas hominum eruditorum sententias: modo suis opinionibus frui pacifice velint, et neque docendo, neque disputando, neque scribendo, a publica confessione secedere, aut errores suos (si tamen errores revera fuerint) in scandalum cujusvis, multo magis ecclesiæ aut reipublicæ divulgare.—Habes, vir spectatissime, sententiam meam.

No. XXIII.

EXTRACT FROM A LETTER OF ARCHBISHOP WAKE TO PROFESSOR SCHURER,
JULY, 1719.

QUÆ de *Formula Consensus* mihi narras, abunde placent, qui, uti nolim laqueum absque causa injici conscientii bonorum atque eruditorum hominum, ita neque fræna laxanda censeo quibuscunque novatoribus ad pacem publice turbandam, eaque vel scribenda vel docenda, quæ viris piis jure scandalum præbeant, quæque

¹ The date of the confession of faith is omitted in the archbishop's letter.

confessioni vestræ olim stabilitæ falsitatis notam injuria inurere videantur. Intra hos igitur limites si steterint magistratus vestri, neque aliquid amplius a Lausannensibus requirant, nisi ut hoc demum fine *Formule Consensus* subscribant; sperandum est nullum schisma, ea de causa, inter vos exoriturum. Pacem publicam tueri, etiam in rebus ad fidem spectantibus, magistratus Christianus et potest et debet. Conscientiis hominum credenda imponere, nisi in rebus claris et perspicuis, et ad salutem omnino necessariis, nec potest, nec debet. Quod si contra faciat, subditis tamen semper licebit ad apostolorum exemplar, si quidem aliquid falsi, aut incertæ veritatis, iis subscribendum injunxerint, *obedire Deo potius quam hominibus*.

No. XXIV.

EXTRACTS FROM ARCHBISHOP WAKE'S LETTER TO PROFESSOR TURRETIN, IN ANSWER TO ONE FROM HIM, DATED DECEMBER 1, 1718.

RES Bernensium ecclesiasticas nondum penitus tranquillas esse et doleo et miror; eoque magis, quod hisce temporibus hæc de decretis divinis altercationes ubique fere alibi ad exitum sint perductæ. Quæ mea sit de iis sententia, nec adhuc cuiquam aperte declaravi, neque, ut deinceps patefaciam, facile me patiar induci. Hoc apud nos, tum ex mandatis regiis, tum ex diu servata (utinam semper servanda) consuetudine fixum est atque stabilitum, neque a quoquam exquirere quid de his rebus sentiat, modo articulis religionis, publica auctoritate constitutis, subscribat: neque in concionibus aut etiam disputationibus theologicis, aliquid amplius de iis determinare, quam quod illi articuli, expresse statuunt, et ab omnibus ad ministerii munus admittendis profitendum requirant.

Then follows an historical narrative of the rise, and occasion, and censure of the Lambeth articles; as also of the rise and progress of Arminianism under the reigns of James I. and Charles I., and of the subsiding of all disputes of that kind under Charles II.—He then subjoins:

Et quidem illud imprimis observatu dignum æstimo, quam moderate, quam prudenter, in hac tam difficili disquisitione, optimi illi viri, martyres ac confessores Christi constantissimi, quos Divina Providentia ad reformandam hanc nostram ecclesiam seligere dignatus est, se gesserunt. Non illi curiositati cujusvis aliquid indulgendum putarunt; non vanis et incertis hominum hypothesibus de decretis divinis alicujus fidem alligare fas esse censuerunt. Sciebant quam inscrutabilia sint consilia Dei, et quanto intervallo omnes nostras cogitationes exuperent. Ideoque non religiose minus quam sapienter inter justos terminos sese continuerunt; neque in necessariis ad fidem nostram de hisce mysteriis stabiendam deficientes; neque in non-necessariis determinandis officiosi; unde forte pro vera fide errorem, pro pace discordiam, pro fraterna unione ac charitate divisionem, odia, inimicitias in ecclesiam Christi inducere poterant.

Hæc fuit eorum simplicitas vere evangelica: pietate non minus quam sapientia commendabilis; eoque magis suscipienda, ac fere pro divina habenda, quod tot annorum experientia reperta sit non solum optimam fuisse pacis ac concordie regulam, verum etiam unicum contra schismata et divisiones remedium.

Speaking afterwards of the Consensus, he adds;

Sunt igitur horum articulorum pars maxima illius generis, in quibus ab invicem dissentire nobis omnibus liceat, absque dispendio veritatis; qui sunt ejusmodi de quibus Deus consilium suum non adeo clare aut præcise revelaverit, quin etiam eruditissimi atque perspicacissimi viri in suis de iis determinationibus errare possint, aut potius nunquam certi esse possunt se non errasse. Quid vero imprudentius, quid arrogantius, quid denique humilitate, non jam dico Christianorum, sed et hominum non nimium sibi blandientium indignum esset, quam de rebus adeo obscuris, adeo incertis, adeo inter ipsos ejusdem communionis symmystas adhuc litigatis, distincte aliquid definire; et ab illis auferre eam quam nos nobis quasi jure nostro asserimus sentiendi libertatem? O quantum potuit insana *φιλανθρία*! Et in aliorum conscientias, quam omnes verbis rejicimus, plerique re exere-

cupimus, dominandi libido! Benedictus Deus, qui alium plerumque, in hoc nostro orbe, animum indiderit!

No. XXV.

ARCHBISHOP WAKE'S LETTER TO MR. JABLONSKI, IN ANSWER TO THE TWO FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

An de Unione Evangelicorum cum Ecclesia Romana agendum sit?

Vel,

An omnis ea de Re Tractatio tanquam periculosa et fallax omnino sit evitanda?

QUOD de fœdere nescio quo cum pontificiis ineundo scribis somnare temerarios quosdam apud vos homines, suæ tranquillitatis magis quam veritatis amatores; non possum non mirari equod inde commodi ecclesiis reformatis proponunt. Adeone ulli e nostris aut incognita aut inexperta est Romanensium superbia atque tyrannis, ut credatur vel illos a suo fastigio potestatis ac infallibilitatis, nostri gratia, sese dimissuros, vel nos eorum causa ad servitutem tam diu rejectam ultro iterum redituros? Hoc tam perniciosum, tam infame facinus, ab animis omnium nostrorum longe avertat Deus! Imo potius bona, patriam, parentes, omnia relinquamus quam ut sic inveniamur *ἐτεροζυγοῦντες ἀπιστοι*: (quidni enim ipsis hic apostoli vocibus utar?)

Neque tamen sic intelligi vellem quasi omnem omnino de pace tractatum etiam cum pontificiis refutandum putarem. Tractemus, si libet, sed ut decet, cum æqualibus: neque aut nos in illos potestatem indebitam nobis arrogemus, neque illis in nos concedamus. Christiani sunt illi? et nos Christiani. Catholici? et nos Catholici. Errare nos possumus? etiam illi possunt errare. Liberi sunt illi a domino nostro? neque nos illis ulla in re subditi sumus. Si igitur cum illis omnino sit agendum, ante omnia necesse fuerit in prævias condiciones tractandi convenire; utque mutuo statuatur, nullum esse inter eos vel inter nos infallibilitatis prærogativam, alterutri nostrum a Christo concessam; posse utrinque errari, forte et utrinque erratum esse. Utrorumque ergo dogmata libere examinanda, et ad amussim verbi Dei exigenda. Renuntiandum insuper prætense auctoritati tum summi quem vocant pontificis, tum ecclesiæ Romane in alias Christi ecclesias; ut sic ab eorum dominatione tuti, ex æquo cum illis agere possimus. De pluribus atque præcipuis doctrinæ Christianæ capitibus, in quibus utrinque consentimus, nulla lis erit. De cæteris consideretur imprimis quousque invicem concordari valeat; et in quibus nondum in eandem sententiam concurrere potest, quaratur porro, an talia sint, quæ salva pace mutuo tolerari nequeant. Si hoc conveniatur, quærat denique de liturgiæ publicæ, an talem nobis exhiberi curabunt, ut omnes simul ad eundem Dei cultum amice accedere valeamus. Si qui sint Romanæ ecclesiæ symmysticæ adeo æqui, ut his conditionibus sincere nobiscum agere velint, non video cur ab eorum colloquio abstineamus. Absque hujusmodi stipulatione præmissa frustra cum iis tractabimus, nisi sub pacis conciliandæ pretextu veritate renuntiare decreverimus.

Habes, vir clarissime, meam qualemcunque hac de re sententiam; extemporaneam quidem illam, nec pro materiæ dignitate satis ponderatam; sed tamen justam, et, nisi ego plurimum fallor, talem a qua absque extremo periculo nunquam a nostris discedi possit. Faxit Deus, ut in hisce considerandis non tam nostra quaeramus quam ea quæ sint Jesu Christi! Nec adeo hujus sæculi pacem amemus, ut futuri præmia amittamus. Tibi, vir præstantissime, sapientiam, prudentiam, eruditionem non vulgarem, concessit Deus; etiam constantiam in veritate tuenda, pro qua tanta et huc usque passus fueris, et deinceps pati te paratum ostendis. Tuo itaque exemplo alios instruas, neque concordiam atque unionem cum ullis Christi discipulis, ubi justis conditionibus iniri possit, pertinaciter refugere; neque iniquis conditionibus stolidè timideve admittere; aut vana spe pacis deliniti, ad servitutis papalis *jugum colla* submittere, *quod neque nos neque patres nostri ferre potuere*. Hoc tam grave scandalum, tam perniciosam prævaricationem ab ecclesiis reformatis ut semper avertat Deus, summo ardore precatur, spectatissime vir, frater tuus in Christo colendissimus, &c.

TABLES
OF
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY
FROM
THE ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY
TO
THE PRESENT TIME.

ABSTRACTED FROM VATER'S *SYNCHRONISTISCHEN TAFELN*,

By FRANCIS CUNNINGHAM.

[Reprinted from the Edition of 1831, Boston, New England.]

Political Events		External History of the Church	Internal Government
33	<p>Tiberius is emperor of the Romans.</p> <p>37. CALIGULA. 43. CLAUDIUS.</p> <p>50.</p> <p>54. NERO.</p> <p>64. 70. Destruction of Jerusalem. 95. Under DOMITIAN,</p>	<p>Institution of Christianity. Day of Pentecost.</p> <p>Oppression of the Christians by Herod Agrippa.</p> <p>Paul's first apostolical journey to Greece.</p> <p>Paul's second great journey. Many churches founded wholly independent of Judaism.</p> <p>Christians put to death at Rome.</p> <p>the Christians oppressed at Rome.</p> <p>Continued spread of Christianity in the Roman empire.</p>	<p>The 'council of Jerusalem,' so called.</p> <p>Christians gradually freeing themselves from the Jewish law.</p> <p>Growing authority and dignity of the first presbyter (<i>ἐπίσκοπος</i>).</p>
100	<p>Under TRAJAN . . .</p> <p>Under ADRIAN . . . ANTONINUS, the philosopher.</p> <p>193. SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS.</p>	<p>Oppression (under the edict against secret societies). Pliny's letter. More protection.</p> <p>Persecution of the Christians in Asia Minor, and at Lyons.</p> <p>Diffusion of Christianity more and more rapid.</p>	<p>Synods in Asia Minor. Traces of union for purposes of discipline and of closer connexion of the churches in different places.</p> <p>Synods held to consult on the subject of the Easter festival.</p> <p>Gradual advance toward ecclesiastical aristocracy.</p>
200	<p>222. ALEXANDER SEVERUS</p> <p>Under MAXIMINUS .</p> <p>244. Philip, the Arabian</p> <p>249. DECIUS.</p>	<p>favourable to the Christians.</p> <p>the Christians oppressed.</p> <p>favours the Christians.</p> <p>The Christians persecuted throughout the empire, till 251.</p>	<p>Authority of the bishops more confirmed. Various new officers in the church.</p> <p>Severity shown to the <i>Lapsi</i>, or 'fallen' from their Christian profession.</p>

N.B.—The names of those who were known as theological writers are printed in italics, to dis-
so called, are enclosed in parentheses. The names of the Roman emperors, and of the popes,
emperors by *.

Remarkable Persons	Doctrines and Corruptions	Religious Observances	
<p>The Apostles and their assistants.</p> <p><i>St. Paul.</i></p> <p>The Epistles of St. Paul, and probably the other writings of the N. T. about this time.</p> <p><i>Clement at Rome.</i></p>	<p>(Simon Magus.)</p> <p>Controversy between the Jewish and Heathen Christians.</p> <p>Belief in the Millennium at Thessalonica.</p> <p>Ἐνώσις ψευδώνυμος at Ephesus. (Cerinthus.) The simple Christianity of the first centuries.</p>	<p><i>Agapæ</i>, or 'feasts of charity.'</p> <p>The Sunday more and more solemnly observed.</p>	33
<p><i>Ignatius</i>, bishop of Antioch.</p> <p><i>Polycarp</i>, bishop of Smyrna.</p> <p><i>Papias</i>, bishop of Hierapolis.</p> <p><i>Justin Martyr.</i></p> <p><i>Anicetus</i>, bishop of Rome.</p> <p><i>Irenæus</i>, bishop of Lyons.</p> <p><i>Miltiades, Athenagoras</i>, and other defenders of the Christian religion.</p> <p><i>Pantænus.</i></p> <p><i>Victor</i>, bishop of Rome.</p> <p><i>Clement</i> of Alexandria.</p> <p><i>Tertullian</i> at Carthage.</p>	<p>Separation of those who cling to the Mosaic law. (Nazarenes, Ebionites.) (Gnostics: Saturninus, Basilides, Valentine.) (Ophites.) (Marcion.) (Montanists.) (Tatian, Encratites.) (Praxeas, Artemon, Antitrinitarians.)</p> <p>Translations of the Bible. Agreement in the Creed of the chief churches.</p>	<p>Tendency to Demonology.</p> <p>Controversies concerning the time of keeping Easter, or the paschal feast.</p> <p>New dispute concerning the Easter festival.</p> <p>Various usages more settled.</p>	100
<p><i>Caius</i> at Rome.</p> <p><i>Origen</i> at Alexandria.</p> <p><i>Gregory</i>, Thaumaturgus.</p> <p><i>Dionysius</i>, bishop of Alexandria.</p> <p><i>Cyprian</i>, bishop of Carthage.</p>	<p>Philosophical Christianity at Alexandria.</p> <p>Tertullian, Montanist. Wrote in Latin.</p> <p>(Noëtus.)</p> <p>(Arabians.)</p> <p>Dispute about the reception of those who had fallen from the Christian faith.</p>	<p>Faith in the power of the sign of the cross.</p> <p>Over estimation of celibacy.</p> <p>Public confession before a return to the church was allowed.</p>	200

tinguish them from those who merely held offices in the church. The names of the heretics are printed in small capitals. The emperors of Constantinople are distinguished from the Roman

Political Events		External History of the Church	Internal Government
200	<p>Under GALLUS . . .</p> <p>284. DIOCLETIAN with MAXIMIAN. Galerius and Constantius Chlorus.</p>	<p>new oppressions. After this more quiet.</p> <p>294. Christians not yet wholly free from oppression.</p>	<p>Synods held to consult concerning baptism of infants and heretics, and against Paul of Samosata.</p>
300	<p>306. CONSTANTINE the Great. LACINIUS.</p> <p>323. CONSTANTINE alone</p> <p>Constantinople, seat of government.</p> <p>337. The sons of Constantine. Division of the empire.</p> <p>340. CONSTANS alone in the Western empire. CONSTANTIUS in the Eastern.</p> <p>351. Constantius alone.</p> <p>361. JULIAN.</p> <p>363. JOVIAN. 364. VALENTINIAN I. VALENS in the East.</p> <p>379. THEODOSIUS the Great.</p> <p>395. Final separation of the Roman empire into the Eastern and Western empires.</p>	<p>303. Violent persecution of the Christians till 310 and 312.</p> <p>declares for Christianity.</p> <p>Ulphilas, bishop of the Goths. The Christians oppressed.</p> <p>More and more severe laws against heretics.</p>	<p>Severity shown to the <i>Lapsi</i> and <i>Traditores</i>, so called—<i>i. e.</i> those who had delivered the sacred writings of the Christians to the magistrates, in order to be burned in the persecution under Diocletian.</p> <p>Meletian schism at Alexandria. 325. I. <i>Concil. œcumen.</i> at Nice. Its decrees confirmed by the emperor. Metropolitan government becomes confirmed.</p> <p>Synods at Antioch and Sardis, {to consult upon church government and the Arian controversy.</p> <p>Synods at Sirmium. 359. At Rimini, and Seleucia.</p> <p>Meletian schism at Antioch; the <i>Schisma Luciferi</i>.</p> <p>381. II. <i>Concil. œcumen.</i> against heretics at Constantinople. The bishop of Constantinople has equal rank with the Roman bishop. The bishops of Alexandria continually hostile to those of Constantinople.</p>

Remarkable Persons	Doctrines and Corruptions	Religious Observances	
<p>253. Stephen, bishop of Rome.</p> <p><i>Pierius Pamphilus.</i> Methodius, bishop of Tyre.</p>	<p>Novatians. (Sabellius.) (Paul of Samosata.) (Manichæans.)</p>	<p>Gradual approach to monastic life in Egypt.</p>	200
<p><i>Lactantius.</i></p> <p>Alexander, bishop of Alexandria. <i>Eusebius</i>, bishop of Cæsarea. <i>Athanasius</i>, bishop of Alexandria. (334. Exiled, returns, and is again exiled.)</p> <p>Eusebius of Nicomedia.</p> <p>Ursinus and Valens, bishops in Thrace. <i>Cyril</i> at Jerusalem. <i>Hilarius</i>, bishop of Poitiers. <i>Gregory</i> Nazianzen. <i>Ephraim</i> the Syrian. <i>Basil</i> the Great. <i>Gregory</i> of Nyssa. <i>Epiphanius.</i> <i>Apollinaris.</i> <i>Ambrose</i>, bishop of Milan. <i>Diodorus</i> of Tarsus. Ithacius. Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria. <i>Jerome.</i> <i>Augustin.</i> <i>Chrysostom.</i></p>	<p>311. Donatian controversy in Africa.</p> <p>319. Arian controversy at Alexandria; <i>ὁμοούσιος</i> (opposed to <i>ἀνόμοιος</i>, and afterwards to <i>ὁμοιοούσιος</i>).</p> <p>The Arian doctrine the prevailing one. (The Arians divide into the semi-Arians and the strict Arians.) (Ætius.)</p> <p>Restoration of the rights of Nicæan teachers in the East.</p> <p>Messalians. (Priscillianists.)</p> <p>Controversies concerning Origen and his doctrine.</p>	<p>Antony, the most remarkable of the Eremites (Hermits) in Egypt.</p> <p>The <i>Κοινὸν</i> of Pachomius (a sort of convent).</p> <p>Monastic laws of Basil the Great.</p> <p>Jovinian interferes to suppress superstition.</p>	300

Political Events	External History of the Church	Internal Government
<p>400</p> <p>408. * THEODOSIUS II. German nations in possession of the Eastern Roman empire.</p> <p>VALENTINIAN III.</p> <p>Pulcheria. MARCIAN. 450.</p> <p>* LEO I. of Thrace. 476. End of the Western Roman empire.</p> <p>BASILISCUS.</p> <p>477. ZENO.</p> <p>486. Clovis, king of the Franks. 491. ANASTASIUS. 493. Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths.</p>	<p>Christianity in Persia confirmed.</p> <p>Many of the German nations become (Arian) Christians.</p> <p>Catholic Christians persecuted amongst the Vandals (who were Arians).</p> <p>396. Clovis, a Catholic Christian.</p>	<p>Innocent has a vicar at Thessalonica in right of his succession to the apostle Peter.</p> <p>411. Collision with the Donatists. Appeals to Rome. Contests between the dioceses of Vienne and Arles. The Roman bishop has vicars in Gaul. 431. III. <i>Concil. æcumen.</i> at Ephesus. 449. 'Robber-Synod' at Ephesus. 451. IV. <i>Concil. æcumen.</i> at Chalcedon; where the patriarch of Constantinople was invested with new dignity, and the system of Patriarchs and Metropolitans perfected.</p> <p>Edict of Basiliscus in favour of the Monophysites.</p> <p>The eccles. oligarchy fully developed; Rome the centre of the Western church, in contest with the patriarch of Constantinople.</p>
<p>500</p> <p>518. JUSTIN I.</p> <p>526. JUSTINIAN I.</p> <p>Conquests of the Franks. 534. Conquest of the kingdom of the Vandals in Africa for the emperor. Conquests in Italy, which end</p>	<p>Spread of the Nestorian Church in the eastern parts of Asia.</p> <p>Conversion of various nations in the east of Europe.</p> <p>In these conquered countries Arianism yields to the Catholic doctrines.</p>	<p>Collections of ecclesiastical laws by Dionysius the Little, Fulgentius Ferrandus, and John Scholasticus.</p>

Remarkable Persons	Doctrines and Corruptions	Religious Observances	
<p>Innocent, bishop of Rome.</p> <p><i>Theodorus</i> of Mop-suestia.</p> <p><i>Cyril</i> of Alexandria.</p> <p><i>Isidore</i> of Pelusium.</p> <p><i>Orosius</i>.</p> <p>Zosimus, bishop of Rome.</p> <p><i>Theodoret</i>.</p> <p>Nestor, bishop of Con-stantinople.</p> <p><i>Prosper</i> of Aquitain.</p> <p>John, bishop of Anti-och.</p> <p>440. Leo the Great, bishop of Rome.</p> <p><i>Socrates, Sozomenus</i>.</p> <p>Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria.</p> <p>Simplicius, patriarch of Rome.</p> <p>Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople.</p> <p>Felix, patriarch of Rome.</p> <p>498. Symmachus, pa-triarch of Rome.</p>	<p>The Pelagian contro-versy breaks out.</p> <p>Augustin's doctrines of free grace and original sin.</p> <p>Semipelagians in Gaul.</p> <p>430. Nestorian con-troversy. Separation of the Nestorians from other Christians in Persia.</p> <p>Eutychians, or Mo-nophysites.</p> <p>The doctrine of the church in opposition to Nestor and Eutychius.</p> <p>Continued disturb-ances of the Monophy-sites in Egypt and Syria.</p> <p>(Petrus Fullo, Timo-theus Ælurus, Petrus Mongus.)</p> <p>482. Henoticon. (Acephali.)</p> <p>In the west the deci-sions of the council of Chalcedon held fast. Se-paration of the Eastern and Western churches.</p>	<p>Celibacy made more important than ever.</p> <p>Vigilantius opposes the superstitions of the times.</p> <p>Jo. Cassian in Gaul, an advocate of monastic life.</p> <p>'Stylitæ,' or 'pillar saints.'</p> <p>'Acemeti,' or 'Watch-ers.'</p> <p>Private confessional.</p> <p>Liturgy of Mamertus, bishop of Vienne, regu-lating processions, &c.</p>	<p>400</p>
<p><i>Boëthius</i>.</p> <p>514. Hormisdas, pa-triarch of Rome.</p> <p><i>Cassiodorus</i>.</p> <p><i>Theodorus</i>.</p> <p><i>Procopius</i> of Gaza.</p> <p>537. Vigilius, patri-arch of Rome.</p>	<p>518. Abolition of the Henoticon.</p> <p>519. Re-union of the Eastern and Western churches, and exclusion of the united Monophy-sites.</p> <p>(Severus. Phtharto-latræ. Aphthartolatræ. Agnoëta.)</p>	<p>515. Benedict's mo-nastic rules.</p> <p>Forms of hymns. De-cided that one of the Trinity was crucified in the flesh.</p>	<p>500</p>

Political Events	External History of the Church	Internal Government
<p>500</p>	<p>553. with the downfall of the kingdom of the Ostrogoths.</p> <p>568. Kingdom of the Lombards.</p>	<p>Restraints on Christianity in Britain.</p> <p>King of the Lombards adopts the tenets of the Nicene Catholics.</p> <p>Gregory the Great sends a successful mission amongst the Anglo-Saxons.</p> <p>Columban in the south of Germany.</p> <p>553. V. <i>Concil. œcumen.</i> at Constantinople.</p> <p>Violent contest about the title: <i>Episcopus œcum.</i></p>
<p>600</p>	<p>610. HERRACLIUS.</p> <p>Great consequence of the 'major domus' in France.</p> <p>641. CONSTANS II.</p> <p>Pepin of Herstall.</p>	<p>St. Gall, in Helvetia.</p> <p>Doctrines of Mohamed spread wide by his conquests.</p> <p>Further conversion of the Anglo-Saxons to Christianity.</p> <p>Oppression of the Christians under the Saracens.</p> <p>Conversion of the Frieslanders and Germans, by Kilian and Willibrord.</p> <p>638. The edict of Heraclius, called the 'Ecthesis.'</p> <p>648. Edict of Constans called the 'Type,' or 'Formulary.'</p> <p>680. VI. <i>Concil. œcumen.</i> at Constantinople.</p>
<p>700</p>	<p>711. PHILIPPICUS.</p> <p>712. The kingdom of the Visigoths subdued by the Saracens.</p> <p>713. ANASTASIUS.</p> <p>717. Leo ISAUERICUS.</p> <p>Luitprand, king of the Lombards, extends his power in Italy.</p>	<p>Boniface, apostle of the Germans.</p> <p>Boniface true to the Pope of Rome.</p>

Remarkable Persons	Doctrines and Corruptions	Religious Observances	
<p><i>Junilius.</i></p> <p>553. Pelagius, patriarch of Rome.</p> <p><i>Gregory of Tours.</i> <i>John, 'the Faster.'</i></p> <p><i>Gregory the Great,</i> patriarch of Rome. <i>Isidore,</i> bishop of Seville.</p>	<p>Contest in Gaul for Augustine's doctrines of 'free grace' and 'original sin.'</p> <p>Origen's doctrines condemned.</p> <p>The Three Chapters condemned; continued dispute on this subject.</p> <p>Union of the various parties of the oppressed Monophysites through the exertions of Jacob;—hence called 'Jacob's Christians,' or 'Jacobites.'</p> <p>(Philoponus.)</p> <p>Distinct traces of the worship of images and saints, and of a belief in purgatory.</p>	<p>Columban active in the cause of Monachism.</p> <p>Canon of the mass (instituted by Gregory).</p> <p>Pompous ceremonies. Hymns. Relics. Worship of images.</p>	500
<p>Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople.</p> <p>Honorius, patriarch of Rome.</p> <p>Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem.</p> <p>Maximus.</p> <p>Martin, patriarch of Rome, exiled.</p> <p>Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury.</p> <p>Wilfrid, bishop of York.</p> <p>Sergius, patriarch of Rome.</p> <p><i>Beda Venerabilis.</i></p>	<p>Body of divinity by Isidore and Leontius. Soon after by Taio, or Tajo.</p> <p>Monothelism adopted to unite the Monophysites with the Catholic church.</p> <p>Monothelism condemned.</p>	<p>The western monks gradually merged in the clergy.</p> <p>Monastic life among the Anglo-Saxons.</p> <p>Latin language used in public worship in England.</p>	600
<p>Constantine, patriarch of Rome.</p> <p><i>John Damascenus.</i></p> <p>GREGORY II. and III. Roman popes—independent of Constantinople.</p>	<p>Philippicus restores the doctrines of Monothelism to their former consequence; and Anastasius revives those of the IV. Council.</p>	<p>Latin service introduced into the churches of Germany, by Boniface.</p>	700

Political Events	External History of the Church	Internal Government
<p>700</p> <p>741. CONSTANTINE Copronym.</p> <p>752. Pepin the Little, king of the Franks, conquers Aistulphus, king of the Lombards.</p> <p>771. Charles alone king of France.</p> <p>CONSTANTINE Porphyrogenitus, and his mother Irene.</p>	<p>Conquests and conversions of Charlemagne amongst the Saxons and Westphalians.</p>	<p>The pope absolves the Franks from the oath of allegiance to King Childeric. Pepin crowned by Boniface, and Pope Stephen II.</p> <p>Charlemagne's <i>Capitularia</i>.</p> <p>787. Synod at Nice for the re-introduction of the worship of images.</p> <p>794. Worship of images condemned by the synod of Frankfort.</p>
<p>800</p> <p>CHARLEMAGNE, Roman emperor.</p> <p>801. NICEPHORUS.</p> <p>804. The Saxons wholly subdued by Charlemagne.</p> <p>813. * LEO Armen.</p> <p>814. LEWIS, the Debonnaire.</p> <p>827. Heptarchy of England united under Egbert.</p> <p>833. Lewis deposed by his sons, and replaced.</p> <p>840. LOTHAIRE in Italy.</p> <p>Lewis in Germany.</p> <p>Charles the Bald in France.</p> <p>855. LEWIS II. Lothaire, king of Lotharingia.</p> <p>871. Alfred, king of England.</p>	<p>Bishoprics instituted among the Saxons.</p> <p>Christianity carried amongst the Bulgarians. Ansgar, apostle of the North.</p> <p>Conversion of the Bohemians and Moravians.</p> <p>The Bulgarians become Christians.</p> <p>Cyril and Methodius active in carrying Christianity amongst the Moravians.</p>	<p>The election of the popes must be confirmed by the emperor.</p> <p>The bishops and pope concerned in the rebellion of Lewis's sons against their father.</p> <p>Great influence of the clergy also in the quarrels of these sons with each other.</p> <p>Distinct traces of the 'decretal Epistles,' so called, attributed to Isidore, bishop of Seville.</p> <p>The papal authority extended over all the West.</p> <p>Controversy between the Greek and Latin churches.</p> <p>Episcopal jurisdiction even over the royal house of the Franks.</p> <p>Controversy concerning Hincmar, bishop of Laon.</p>

Remarkable Persons	Doctrines and Corruptions	Religious Observances	
<p>741. ZACHARIAS. STEPHEN II. receives the grant of the ex-archate and Pentapolis from Pepin.</p> <p><i>Alcuin</i> employed by Charlemagne to found schools in his empire. <i>Theodorus</i> Studites. LEO III.</p>	<p>767. The doctrine that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son as well as the Father, defended against the Greek church.</p> <p>Felix, bishop of Urgell. His followers called 'Adoptians.'</p>	<p>726. Worship of images forbidden by the emperor.</p> <p>Chrodegang's rules for the 'Canons.' Converts in Germany. More strict prohibition of the worship of images in the Greek church.</p> <p>Ritual of the Roman church finds admission in the empire of Charlemagne.</p>	700
<p><i>Agobard</i>, archbishop of Lyons. <i>Ebbo</i>, archbishop of Rheims. <i>Rabanus</i> Maurus, archbishop of Mentz. GREGORY IV. <i>Haymo</i>, bishop of Halberstadt. <i>Paschasius Radbert</i>. <i>Ratram</i>, or <i>Bertram</i>, of Corby. <i>Jo. Scotus Erigena</i>. SERGIUS II. <i>Hincmar</i>, archbishop of Rheims. <i>Godeschalk</i>. <i>Lupus</i>. <i>Remigius</i>, archbishop of Lyons. Pope Joan.</p> <p>858. NICHOLAS I. <i>Photius</i>, patriarch of Constantinople.</p> <p>867. ADRIAN I.</p>	<p>(Paulicians, a branch of the Manichæans.)</p> <p>Different opinions concerning the number of the sacraments.</p> <p>Controversy concerning Transubstantiation.</p> <p>Controversy concerning the doctrines of 'predestination' and 'free grace.'</p> <p>Violent controversy between the Greek and Latin churches.</p>	<p>New prohibition of the worship of images in the Greek empire. <i>Claudius</i>, bishop of Turin, and <i>Agobard</i>, oppose the prevailing superstition.</p> <p>Cloisters in the North.</p> <p>842. The worship of images permanently re-instated in the Greek empire.</p>	800

Political Events	External History of the Church	Internal Government
<p>800</p> <p>875. CHARLES II. the Bald, proclaimed emperor by the pope.</p> <p>881. CHARLES III. surnamed 'the Gross.'</p> <p>* LEO, the Philosopher.</p> <p>887. Arnulph, king of Germany.</p> <p>The Huns in possession of Pannonia.</p>	<p>Christians among the Russians.</p> <p>Bohemian princes become Christians.</p>	<p>Great assumption of power by the popes over the kings, for the most part successful.</p> <p>Various persons raised to the throne of Italy, and the imperial crown, by the popes.</p> <p>898. Synod at Rome.</p>
<p>900</p> <p>Huns invade Germany.</p> <p>912. Conrad I. king of Germany.</p> <p>919. Henry the Fowler, king of Germany.</p> <p>Caliphs of Bagdad lose their power.</p> <p>936. Otho the Great, king of Germany;</p> <p>951. ——— victorious in Italy, and over the Huns.</p> <p>962. Otho, emperor.</p> <p>* NICEPHORUS.</p> <p>973. Otho II.</p> <p>987. Hugh Capet, king of France.</p>	<p>911. Rollo is made duke of Normandy, and converted.</p> <p>Christianity preached in Norway;</p> <p>also in Russia.</p> <p>Christianity in Poland and Hungary.</p> <p>Introduced into Russia by Wladimir; into Hungary by St. Stephen; into Poland by Boleslaus.</p>	<p>Measures to restore discipline in the church.</p> <p>The church richly endowed by Otho.</p> <p>998. Robert, king of France, compelled by the pope to separate from his wife, to whom he was related in the fourth degree.</p>
<p>1000</p> <p>1001. HENRY II. Canute the Great.</p> <p>CONRAD II.</p> <p>1039. HENRY III.</p> <p>1056. HENRY IV., a minor.</p> <p>William the Conqueror, king of England.</p>	<p>Christianity introduced in Sweden and Transylvania, and in Denmark universally.</p>	<p>High authority of the emperor in the church.</p> <p>Papal synods against simony.</p> <p>The Norman dukes in the south of Italy hereditary legates of the pope.</p> <p>Ecclesiastical benefices bought and sold.</p>

Remarkable Persons	Doctrines and Corruptions	Religious Observances	
<p>872. JOHN VIII. Learned men at Oxford.</p> <p>STEPHEN V.; after him, confusion and disorder.</p>		<p>Mass in the Slavonian language in Moravia; soon gives way to the Latin ritual.</p>	800
<p>Theodora and Marozia have the chief influence in the election of popes.</p> <p><i>Rotherius.</i> <i>Eutychius</i>, patriarch of Alexandria.</p> <p>954. JOHN XII.</p> <p>963. LEO VIII. The Romans bind themselves by an oath to choose no pope without the concurrence of the emperor. Good influence of the emperor Otho on the popes. <i>Gerbert</i>, archbishop; is made SILVESTER III. 999.</p>	<p>Doctrine of Transubstantiation confirmed.</p>	<p>Worship of the saints more and more extravagant.</p> <p>Odde, abbot of Clugny.</p> <p>Odilo, abbot of Clugny.</p> <p>Ulrich, bishop of Augsburg, declared a saint by the pope.</p>	900
<p>BENEDICT VIII.</p> <p>JOHN XIX. BENEDICT IX. The emperor deposes three popes, and appoints CLEMENT II., DAMASUS II., LEO IX., who maintain their authority. Influence of Hildebrand, afterwards Pope Gregory VII. BENEDICT X.</p>	<p>Paterini, Publicani.</p> <p>Berenger opposes the doctrine of Transubstantiation; with him begins the scholastic theology.</p> <p>Entire separation of the Greek and Latin churches.</p>	<p>New prohibition of marriage to the priests.</p> <p>Controversies concerning the celibacy of the clergy.</p>	1000

	Political Events	External History of the Church	Internal Government
1000	<p>HENRY IV. taken from under his mother's care by the archbishops Hanno and Adelbert. Dissatisfaction of the Saxons and other German states with Henry.</p> <p>The emperor Henry IV. forced to humble himself before the pope.</p> <p>1080. Lombardy for Henry.</p> <p>Rudolph of Swabia, supported as emperor in opposition to Henry.</p> <p>The pope supported by the Normans in Italy and Matilda of Tuscany.</p> <p>1093. Conrad, the son of Henry, against his father. Died 1101.</p>	<p>Christian and heathen kings in Sweden at once.</p> <p>1096. First crusade.</p> <p>1099. Jerusalem taken.</p>	<p>Strict prohibition of 'investiture' by laymen.</p> <p>Papal ban in Poland.</p> <p>William the Conqueror demands the continuation of the right of investiture.</p> <p>Controversy concerning the marriage of Philip of France.</p>
1100	<p>1104. The second son of the emperor rebels against his father, and compels him to resign the crown.</p> <p>1106. HENRY V.</p> <p>The emperor takes possession of Matilda's lands.</p> <p>1125. LOTHAIRE II.</p> <p>1137. CONRAD III.</p> <p>Henry the Lion, duke of Saxony.</p>	<p>Paganism extirpated in Sweden.</p>	<p>The Roman (civil) law taught in schools.</p> <p>The emperor makes new demands on the pope, and retains the right of investiture.</p> <p>Continued violent dispute.</p> <p>1122. Diet at Worms.</p> <p>1123. <i>Concil. Lateran.</i> I.</p> <p>1139. <i>Concil. Lateran.</i> II., to bring all things, if possible, before the papal tribunal.</p> <p><i>Gratiani Decretum.</i></p>

Remarkable Persons	Doctrines and Corruptions	Religious Observances	
<p>NICHOLAS II. The choice of the pope by the cardinals passes into an established custom.</p> <p>ALEXANDER II. maintains himself against Honorius.</p> <p>1073. GREGORY VII. Papal power at the highest. Attack upon the emperor Henry IV. Henry wishes to depose the pope. Papal law against the emperor, who is forced to come in penance to Canusium.</p> <p>Clemens III., the emperor's pontiff.</p> <p>1087. VICTOR III.</p> <p>1088. URBAN II.</p> <p>The pope holds a synod at Clermont.</p> <p>PASCHAL II.</p>	<p>Theophylact's collections for the critical study of the Bible.</p> <p>The Paulicians oppressed in the Greek empire.</p> <p>Roscelin.</p> <p>The Greek church seeks to reunite itself with the Latin, and to get help against the Turks.</p>	<p>Armed pilgrimages to the Holy Land.</p> <p>Strict injunction of celibacy. All those excommunicated who confess to married priests.</p> <p>The Roman liturgy introduced in Spain.</p> <p>The Carthusian and Cistercian orders founded.</p>	1000
<p>Matilda, daughter of the duke of Tuscany, gives all her possessions to the pope.</p> <p>The emperor takes the pope and cardinals prisoners.</p> <p>GELASIUS II. (Gregory VIII.)</p> <p>CALIXTUS II. solemnly excommunicates the emperor.</p> <p>1124. HONORIUS II. confirms the emperor as king of Rome.</p> <p>1130. INNOCENT II. generally acknowledged through the influence of St. Bernard. Interdict against France.</p> <p>1145. EUGENIUS III. <i>Peter of Poitiers. Peter of Blois.</i></p>	<p>(Peter de Bruis.)</p> <p>Dogmas and controversies of Peter Abelard.</p> <p>Mention made of the seven sacraments.</p> <p>Dogmatic systems of Robert Pulleyn, Peter Lombard, and Alanus of Ryssel.</p> <p>(Arnold of Brescia.)</p> <p>Controversy concerning the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary.</p>	<p>St. Bernard, abbot of Clairval, in high repute, a mystic, and zealous advocate of the study of the Bible.</p> <p>Order of Knights of St. John, and Templars.</p> <p>Abbot Peter Venerabilis at Clugny.</p> <p>St. Bernard insists on confession to the priests. Decrees of the Greek emperor MANUEL Comnenus concerning monks.</p>	1100

	Political Events	External History of the Church	Internal Government
1100	<p>1152. FREDERICK I. asserts his authority in Lombardy.</p> <p>1169. William II., king of Sicily, allied with pope Alexander.</p> <p>1177. Peace of Venice.</p> <p>1180. Philip Augustus, king of France.</p> <p>1191. HENRY VI.</p> <p>1198. Disputed election of emperor, between Philip of Swabia, and Otho of Saxony.</p>	<p>1147. Second crusade. Conversions in the country between the Havel and the Elbe, and in Finland; also in the island of Rügen.</p> <p>Supposed correspondence of the pope with a great Christian king in the east of Asia.</p> <p>1189. Third crusade. 1190. Fourth crusade.</p> <p>Crusades to Livonia.</p>	<p>1162. Council of Clarendon held by Henry II. of England.</p> <p>King of England reconciles himself with the pope by certain concessions.</p> <p>The emperor submits to the pope. 1179. <i>Concil. Later. III.</i>, at which new regulations concerning the choice of popes.</p> <p>New disputes between the pope and the emperor.</p> <p>Emperor forbids the appeal to the pope.</p>
1200	<p>Gengiskhan's empire.</p> <p>1204. Latin emperors at Constantinople (till 1261).</p> <p>OTHO IV.</p> <p>1215. FREDERICK II.</p> <p>1226. St. Lewis, king of France.</p>	<p>Bishop Albrecht of Riga.</p> <p>Christian, bishop of Prussia.</p> <p>1217. Fifth crusade.</p> <p>1228. Sixth crusade.</p> <p>Ferdinand of Castile recovers the conquests of the Arabs.</p> <p>1249. Seventh crusade.</p>	<p>Dispute between John of England (Lackland) and the pope ends in the complete submission of the former.</p> <p>1215. <i>Concil. Lat. IV.</i> Its decrees to be annually read before provincial synods.</p> <p>Formal introduction of the Inquisition; at first in the south of France: soon given over to the Dominicans.</p>

Remarkable Persons	Doctrines and Corruptions	Religious Observances
<p><i>John</i> of Salisbury. Absalom, archbishop of Lund. 1160. ALEXANDER III. Victor, rival pope. The emperor excommunicated. Thomas Becket murdered.</p> <p>1185. URBAN III. 1188. CLEMENT III.</p> <p>1198. INNOCENT III. exercises high authority over emperor and kings.</p>	<p>Catharists in Lombardy and the south of France.</p> <p>Measures of the pope against the heretics in the south of France.</p> <p>Peter of Castelnau, inquisitor in the south of France. Prohibition of the Bible in the native tongue.</p>	<p>1100</p> <p>1190. Teutonic order instituted.</p>
<p>The pope assumes the right of deciding upon the claims of Philip and Otho to the title of king of Rome.</p> <p>The emperor Otho's submissive concessions to the pope. 1216. HONORIUS III. The emperor and pope make mutual concessions. 1227. GREGORY IX. breaks with the emperor; violent denunciations on either side. 1230. Pope and emperor reconciled. 1239. Emperor excommunicated again. 1243. INNOCENT IV. declares the emperor deposed at the synod of Lyons.</p>	<p>Sect of the Catharists gains ground.</p> <p>Crusade against the Albigenses. The doctrine of Transubstantiation established as incontrovertible, and all who oppose it condemned as heretics. War against the Albigenses continued. Severe laws against heretics. The pope forbids laymen to dispute on religious matters. Second period of the scholastic theology;—Alexander Hales. Albertus Magnus.</p>	<p>1200</p> <p>Dominicans and Franciscans. The establishment of new orders of monks forbidden. Beghards. Tertiaries, an order of Franciscans. Beghards. Lollards. The beggar-orders favoured; allowed to hear the confessional universally. Lasting controversy between the 'spiritual' Franciscans and the less rigid of the order.</p>

Political Events	External History of the Church	Internal Government
<p>1200</p> <p>1265. Charles of Anjou, king of Sicily.</p> <p>1273. RUDOLPH I. of Hapsburg.</p> <p>1282. Sicilian Vespers.</p> <p>1283. Philip the Fair, king of France.</p> <p>1291. ADOLPHUS of Nassau.</p> <p>Ottoman empire.</p> <p>ALBRECHT of Austria.</p>	<p>Christians wholly driven from Palestine.</p>	<p>Arrangement of the conclave at the choice of pope.</p>
<p>1300</p> <p>1307. HENRY VII. Swiss confederation.</p> <p>1314. LEWIS of Bavaria.</p> <p>Frederick of Austria his competitor for the imperial dignity.</p> <p>1328. Philip VI. Valois, king of France.</p> <p>1342. King Lewis the Great, of Hungary.</p> <p>1346. CHARLES IV.</p> <p>Tamerlane's conquests in Asia.</p>	<p>Rhodes taken by the knights of St. John.</p>	<p>The papal bull 'unam sanctam'—that all things were under papal jurisdiction.</p> <p>Philip of France appeals to a general council.</p> <p>Reformation of the church proposed at the council of Vienna.</p> <p>Papal 'reserves,' 'provisions,' and other contrivances to extort money.</p> <p>The 'spirituals' maintain that the pope is subject to a general council in matters of faith.</p> <p>The imperial electors combine against the pope.</p>

Remarkable Persons	Doctrines and Corruptions	Religious Observances	
<p>1254. ALEXANDER IV. active in Sicily and Germany.</p> <p>1264. CLEMENT IV.; negotiation with the Greek emperor.</p> <p>1271. GREGORY X.</p> <p>The emperor resigns all rights in the exarchate.</p> <p>Orsini and Colonna.</p> <p>1295. BONIFACE VIII. His haughty treatment of various sovereigns.</p>	<p>Influence of Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura on the theology of the day.</p>	<p>Festival of the Holy Sacrament.</p> <p>Festival of the 'immaculate conception.'</p> <p>Celibacy introduced universally amongst the clergy of Denmark, Sweden, and Hungary.</p> <p>Shrine of Loretto brought by angels from Palestine.</p> <p>Flagellantes.</p> <p>Papal jubilee, and remission of sins to all who made a pilgrimage to the church of St. Peter in Rome.</p>	1200
<p>The pope and Philip in violent dispute.</p> <p>Philip excommunicated. He causes the pope to be taken prisoner.</p> <p>1305. CLEMENT V.; 1309. — removes to Avignon. Controversy with the emperor.</p> <p>JOHN XXII. Violent dispute with the emperor Lewis.</p> <p>1334. BENEDICT XII. The papal authority declines in Italy.</p> <p>1342. CLEMENT VI.</p> <p>1352. INNOCENT VI. The Greek emperor acknowledges subjection to him.</p> <p>1362. URBAN V. Controversy between the pope and emperor.</p>	<p>Scotists, followers of John Duns Scotus.</p> <p>Controversy concerning certain doctrines of the pope.</p> <p>Third period of the scholastic theology. — Wastes itself still more in subtleties. Controversy concerning Realism and Nominalism.</p> <p>Inward Christianity preached in Bohemia.</p>	<p>Order of the Knights Templars extirpated.</p> <p>Jubilee ordered every fifty years.</p> <p>Union of the strict Franciscans with the pope, and the 'Brethren of the Community.'</p>	1300

Political Events		External History of the Church	Internal Government
1300	<p>1378. WENCESLAUS.</p> <p>1388. Union of the three northern kingdoms under Denmark. Bajazet, emperor of the Turks.</p>	Lithuania Christian.	<p>Papal authority undermined by the 'Schism.'</p> <p>Measures taken to reconcile the Schism, and restore the old order of things. National Synod at Paris.</p>
1400	<p>1411. SIGISMUND.</p> <p>1420. War of the Hussites. Maid of Orleans. The Medici at Florence.</p> <p>1438. ALBRECHT II.</p> <p>1440. FREDERICK III.</p> <p>1444. King Ladislaus defeated by the Turks near Varna.</p> <p>1453. Constantinople taken by the Turks. War of the red and white roses in England.</p> <p>1462. Iwan Basilje- witch the Great, in Russia.</p> <p>1474. Spain united under Ferdinand and Isabella. Constant wars in Italy between France, the pope, Spain, and the emperor.</p>	New preparations for a crusade.	<p>1409. Council at Pisa. Resolved to reform the church.</p> <p>1414. Council at Constance. The pope is forced to submit to the decrees of the council. Council at Basil.</p> <p>The German princes support the decrees of the council of Basil. 'Pragmatic Sanction' for France.</p> <p>1448. Concordat with the Germans at Vienna.</p> <p>Violent controversy of the pope with Bohemia, Naples, Florence, and Venice.</p>

Remarkable Persons	Doctrines and Corruptions	Religious Observances	
<p>Gregory XI. at Rome.</p> <p>1378. URBAN VI. Great western schism. <i>Clement VII.</i> at Avignon.</p> <p>The popes excommunicate each other.</p> <p>BONIFACE XI. at Rome.</p> <p><i>Benedict XIII.</i> at Avignon.</p>	<p>Wickliffe's doctrines. Great repute of the University at Paris, particularly as regards doctrines. (Peter d'Ailly. Jo. Gerson.)</p> <p>Followers of Wickliffe.</p>	<p>Sale of indulgences.</p>	1300
<p>INNOCENT VII. at Rome.</p> <p>GREGORY XI. at Rome.</p> <p>ALEXANDER V. summons Ladislaus, king of Hungary and Naples, to appear before his tribunal</p> <p>JOHN XXIII. deposed.</p> <p>MARTIN V. avoids the reformation of the church by hindering the meeting of the council.</p> <p>1431. EUGENIUS IV. summons an opposition council at Ferrara, at which a reconciliation with the Greeks is the chief business.</p> <p>The council at Basil elect Felix V. in opposition to Eugenius.</p> <p>1447. Nicholas V. patron of learning.</p> <p>1455. CALIXTUS III.</p> <p>1458. PIUS II. (<i>Æneas Sylvester.</i>)</p> <p>1461. PAUL I.</p> <p>1471. SIXTUS IV.</p>	<p>Huss and Jerome, of Prague, burnt.</p> <p>Hussites (Utraquists, Taborites).</p> <p>1435. Utraquists reconciled with the church.</p> <p>Thomas à Kempis, John Wesselius, and John de Vesalia, recommend the study of the sacred Scriptures, and inward Christianity.</p> <p>Bohemian brethren.</p> <p>Influence of the revival of learning, and of the discovery of the art of printing, and of the learned men; Erasmus of Rotterdam, and others.</p>	<p>The rights of the beggar-orders supported by papal bulls.</p> <p>Minorites, or Fratricelli, of the order of St. Francis.</p> <p>Plenary indulgence sold in Germany.</p>	1400

	Political Events	External History of the Church	Internal Government
1400	<p>1483. Charles VIII., king of France. Switzerland free.</p> <p>1492. Discovery of America.</p> <p>1493. MAXIMILIAN I.</p> <p>1498. LEWIS XII., king of France.</p>	<p>Moors driven entirely from Spain, and forcibly converted to Christianity.</p>	<p>General Inquisition established in Spain.</p>
1500	<p>1508. Henry VIII., king of England.</p> <p>1515. Francis I. of France.</p> <p>Charles I., king of Spain, Naples, and the Netherlands.</p>	<p>Christianity in America.</p>	<p>Pragmatic Sanction introduced again in France.</p> <p>Council of Pisa.</p>

HISTORY OF THE

Political Events	Popes and History of the Catholic Church	History of the Lutheran Church
<p>1519. Frederick the Wise, elector of Saxony.</p> <p>1520. CHARLES V.</p> <p>1521. Diet at Worms.</p> <p>1522. Diet at Nuremberg.</p> <p>War of the peasants.</p>	<p>1518. Cardinal Cajetan gives Luther a hearing at Augsburg.</p> <p>Papal bull asserting the power of the pope to grant indulgences.</p> <p>Miltitz, pope's legate.</p> <p>Papal bull against Luther.</p> <p>New bull against Luther.</p> <p>Papal nuncios, Caraccioli and Alexander.</p> <p>1522. ADRIAN VI.</p> <p>Cheregati, papal nuncio at Nuremberg. Jesuits founded by Ignatius Loyola.</p> <p>CLEMENS VII.</p> <p>Campegius, papal nuncio.</p> <p>The German princes insist on a council.</p>	<p>1517. Luther's 95 propositions against indulgences, posted up at Wittenberg.</p> <p>1518. Luther appeals <i>ad Papam melius informandum</i>, and so on, to a general council.</p> <p>Luther continues to write and advance in the freedom of his views.</p> <p>Luther at Worms before the Diet. Edict of Worms.</p> <p>Luther at the Wartburg. Luther's translation of the New Testament.</p> <p>Mass discontinued at Wittenberg.</p> <p>Luther returns to Wittenberg.</p> <p>Doctrines of Luther spread with great rapidity.</p> <p>1525. Open reformation in Prussia and the electorate of Saxony.</p>

Remarkable Persons	Doctrines and Corruptions	Religious Observances	
1484. INNOCENT VIII. 1492. ALEXANDER VI. and his sons John and Cæsar Borgia; their cunning and cruelty. Cardinal Ximenes, prime minister of Spain.		Great sale of indul- gences for the year of jubilee. St. Peter's begun.	1400
1503. JULIUS II., a warlike prelate. Papal council at the Lateran. 1513. LEO X.	Hoogstraet, ' <i>inquisi- tor hereticæ pravitatis</i> ,' against Reuchlin.	New sale of indul- gences for St. Peter's church. Tetzel and Bernard Samson's measures.	1500

REFORMATION.

History of the Reformed Church	Theologians of the Reformed Church	Theologians of the Lutheran Church	Catholic Theologians and Churchmen
1519. Zuingle opposes the 'indulgence-seller,' Samson, at Zurich; preaches more and more boldly, and is in high repute with the civil authorities. Council at Zurich decree that the Bible shall be the rule of teaching, and not Thomas à Kempis. 1522. Disputation at Zurich. 1523. Second and third disputation at Zurich. 1524. The council at Zurich forbid all masses and worship of images. 1525. Convention of the remaining Catholic cantons.	Leo Judæ. Ecclampadius. Fr. Lambert. Carlstadt in Switzerland. Comeander in the canton of the Grisons.	Ph. Melancthon. A. Carlstadt. Disputation at Leipsic. Disputation at Homburg.	John Eck. Sylvester Prierias. Emser. John Faber. Gallius.

	Political Events	Popes and History of the Catholic Church	History of the Lutheran Church
1500	<p>1526. Peace between France and the emperor.</p> <p>1527. War between France and the emperor.</p> <p>1529. Peace of Cambray.</p> <p>1530. Diet at Augsburg.</p> <p>1531. Ferdinand, king of Rome.</p> <p>1532. John Frederick, elector of Saxony.</p> <p>Henry VIII. of England separates from Catharine of Aragon, . . . Anabaptists at Münster.</p> <p>1536. War between France and the emperor.</p> <p>1538. Treaty of peace between them.</p> <p>Danger from the Turks.</p> <p>The German princes distrustful of the emperor.</p> <p>1542. War again between France and the emperor.</p> <p>1544. Peace of Crespì.</p> <p>1545. Truce with the Turks.</p> <p>1546. Preparations of the emperor against the Protestants.</p> <p>Duke Maurice invades Saxony.</p> <p>The emperor subdues Upper Germany.</p> <p>1547. John Frederick made prisoner.</p>	<p>The pope forms the holy league with France against the emperor.</p> <p>The Capuchins confirmed.</p> <p>1529. The pope and the emperor reconciled.</p> <p>The emperor insists on a general council.</p> <p>Campegius, nuncio of the pope at Augsburg.</p> <p>The pope promises a council.</p> <p>and refuses to obey the pope.</p> <p>King declared the supreme head of the English Church.</p> <p>Paul III.</p> <p>King Henry VIII. excommunicated.</p> <p>Holy league of the emperor and the German princes. The general council deferred by the pope.</p> <p>Order of Jesuits confirmed.</p> <p>1542. The pope calls the council of Trent.</p> <p>Protestant creed condemned at the council of Trent.</p> <p>The pope and the emperor allied against the Protestants.</p> <p>The emperor insists upon the removal of the council from Bologna to Trent.</p>	<p>1526. Saxony and Hesse league themselves for mutual protection.</p> <p>Reformed faith in Sweden; suffered in Denmark.</p> <p>Public worship becomes more and more pure.</p> <p>1529. Diet at Spire.</p> <p>Protest of the German princes.</p> <p>Articles of Torgaw and Schwabach.</p> <p>Confession of Augsburg.</p> <p>1532. Confederacy of Smalcald.</p> <p>Treaty of peace at Nuremberg.</p> <p>Confederacy of Smalcald confirmed.</p> <p>Protestant faith in Poland.</p> <p>1541. Diet at Ratisbon. 'Interim' proposed at Ratisbon.</p> <p>Another diet at Ratisbon.</p> <p>The army of the Protestants advance against the emperor, but without effect.</p>

History of the Reformed Church	Theologians of the Reformed Church	Theologians of the Lutheran Church	Catholic Theologians and Churchmen	
<p>1526. Bucer's attempts to reconcile the disputes concerning the sacrament of the supper.</p> <p>1527. Dispute at Baden.</p> <p>1528. Dispute at Berne; public reformation there; also at Basil and St. Gall.</p> <p>Alliance between Zurich and Berne.</p> <p>Zuingli's Confession of Faith.</p> <p>Confederacy of Zurich, Basil, &c.</p> <p>1531. Religious toleration and peace in Switzerland.</p> <p>1535. Disputation and Reformation at Geneva.</p> <p>The Presbyterian form of government adopted at Geneva.</p> <p>†1544. The disputes between the Swiss theologians and those of Wittenberg break out anew.</p> <p>Ineffectual attempts of Philip of Hesse to unite the Protestants.</p>	<p>Disputation at Ilanz.</p> <p>Bucer, Capito, Pelican.</p> <p>Farel and Viret, in France.</p> <p>John Calvin.</p> <p>Petr. Martyr.</p>	<p>Conference at Upsal, between Olaus and Peter Gallius.</p> <p>1529. Colloq. at Marburg, between Luther and Zuingli.</p> <p>Colloq. at Copenhagen.</p> <p>Taussön.</p> <p>Lorenz Petri, archbishop of Upsal.</p> <p>1541. Religious Conferences at Worms and Ratisbon.</p> <p>1546. Colloq. at Ratisbon.</p> <p>Luther dies.</p>	<p>Murner.</p> <p>Synod at Paris under Duprat, archbishop of Sens.</p> <p>Eliæ.</p> <p>Thom. Cranmer.</p> <p>Papal nuncios, Vergerius and Vorstius.</p>	1500

	Political Events	Popes and History of the Catholic Church	History of the Lutheran Church
1500	<p>Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, throws himself on the mercy of the emperor.</p> <p>Maurice, elector of Saxony.</p> <p>1552. Maurice falls on the emperor by surprise.</p> <p>1553. Mary, queen of England.</p> <p>Augustus, elector of Saxony.</p> <p>1555. Diet of Augsburg.</p>	<p>1550. JULIUS III. calls a council of Trent. The council dispersed. England is once more under the yoke of the pope.</p>	<p>1548. Imperial interim.</p> <p>Interim of Leipsic.</p> <p>Pacification of Passau.</p> <p>Religious peace; mutual toleration.</p>

HISTORY OF THE GREEK AND LATIN CHURCHES.

Political Events	External History	Internal History	Remarkable Persons	Doctrines and Controversies	Ceremonies and Monastic Life
<p>1556. PHILIP II., king of Spain.</p> <p>FERDINAND I.</p> <p>1558. Elizabeth of England.</p> <p>1562. Beginning of the wars of religion in France.</p> <p>1564. MAXIMILIAN II. tolerant.</p>	<p>Jesuit missionaries to China.</p> <p>The influence of the Jesuits against the Protestants in Hungary and Poland.</p>	<p>The pope and the emperor at variance.</p> <p>1559. PIUS IV.</p> <p>1562. Opens the council of Trent again, at which the papal power is confirmed.</p> <p>1566. PIUS V.</p> <p>1567. Bull <i>In cœna Domini</i>, supporting the papal supremacy.</p>	<p><i>Canus.</i></p> <p><i>Espenceus.</i></p> <p>Cardinal Hosius.</p> <p>Ineffectual attempts of the French and Spanish bishops to support their rights against the pope.</p> <p><i>Baius.</i></p> <p>Maldonat.</p> <p>Arius Montanus.</p>	<p>Council of Trent enforces the authority of tradition, of the 'Vulgate,' and decides that the pope alone can determine the true meaning of the Scriptures.</p> <p>1566. Catechism of Trent.</p> <p>The pope condemns the doctrine of Baius.</p>	<p>Spread of the Jesuits.</p> <p>At Trent a theologians.</p> <p>Celibacy enjoined on the priests, the cup denied to laymen at the Lord's supper, and the language of the country forbidden in public worship.</p>
<p>1572. Insurrection in the Netherlands.</p> <p>1574. Henry III., king of France.</p> <p>1576. RUDOLPH II.</p>	<p>1572. Massacre of the Protestants at Paris on St. Bartholomew's day.</p>	<p>1572. GREGORY XIII.</p>			

History of the Reformed Church	Theologians of the Reformed Church	Theologians of the Lutheran Church	
Regular reform in England, under Edward VI. 42 articles of faith.	Bucer in England.	Matth. Flacius.	1500
Consensus Tigurinus.		Osiander. Westphal.	
Calvini Consens. Pastor. Genevens.	Alb. Hardenberg at Bremen.		
Opposition of the Protestants in England.			

HISTORY OF THE EVANGELICAL CHURCHES.

Prosperous and Adverse Events	Ecclesiastical Decrees and Acts of Arbitrary Power	Doctrines of the Lutheran Church	Lutheran Theologians	Reformed Theologians	Doctrines of the Reformed Church	Separate Religious Communities
Cruel persecution of the protestants in England.		Controversies concerning 'justification by faith;' 'good works.' SYNERGISMUS at Königsberg.	Moerlin.	Castalio.		The Anabaptists, brought back from their extravagances by the efforts of Menno Simon, are distinguished into Waterlanders and Flemings; and these last again into Flemings and Friesland-ers.
Great progress of reform in Poland.	1558. Meeting of the princes at Frankfort to put an end to theological disputes.	In Thuringia 'Corpus doctrinæ Philippi-cum.'	Chemnitz.	Beza at the university of Geneva.	Reformation restored in England. Episcopal church in England. Presbyterians and Puritans in Scotland, 1560.	
The Palatine leans to the doctrines of Calvin.	The 39 Articles confirmed.		Wigand.	Doctrines of Geneva.		
Constant dispute between the two Protestant churches.	1562. Act of Uniformity.		Schnepf.	Doctrine and government of that church spread.		
	Nonconformists.	Colloq. at Maulbrunn and Altenburg.	Prenz.	Musæus.	Controversy concerning the doctrine 'de absoluto decreto.'	Antitrinitarians.
		James Andraë attempts to introduce a form of concord.	1560. Melancthon's death.	Hyperius.	Catechism of Heidelberg.	
1572. Consensus Sendoriensis.		1570. Crypto-Calvinists in the electorate of Saxony.			1571. The 39 Articles of the English church.	Independents.
Open reformation in the Netherlands.		1577. Form of Concord.	Chyträus.		Confessio Belgica.	
					The countries in Germany which re-	Faustus Socinus in Poland.

Political Events		External History	Internal History	Remarkable Persons	Doctrines and Controversies	Ceremonies and Monastic Life
1500	1579. 'Union' of Utrecht.			1582. Gebhard, elector of Cologne.	In the Netherlands, Augustine's doctrine of 'free grace' zealously supported.	The Franciscans and Jesuits oppose the strict doctrine of 'free grace;' the Dominicans support it.
	1589. Henry IV., king of France . . .	becomes Roman Catholic.	1585. SIXTUS V. The number of cardinals fixed. 1590. GREGORY XIV. 1592. Clement VIII.	1589. The Russian church has its own patriarch. <i>Baronius.</i> <i>Bellarmin.</i> Papal nuncios at Brussels, Vienna, &c.		
Political Events		External History	Internal History	Remarkable Persons	Doctrines and Corruptions	Religious Observances and Monastic Life
1600	1603. James I., king of England.		The pope at variance with Venice.	<i>Sarpi.</i>		
	1608. Protestant union. 1609. Catholic league. 1610. Lewis XIII. of France. 1612. MATTHIAS.		1605. PAUL V. Peace with Venice.	Cyrrillus Lucaris. <i>Richerius.</i>		
	1619. Ferdinand II. Disturbances in Bohemia. Thirty years' war. 1620. Defeat of the elector Palatine.	1615. Christianity extirpated in Japan.		<i>Petavius.</i> <i>Sirmond.</i>	Morality of the Jesuits (<i>peccatum philosophicum</i>).	1613. <i>Patrologia</i> in France.
			The emperor of Germany leagued with the pope.			1621. Piaris
		1622. Congregatio de propaganda fide. Abyssinia Roman Catholic.	1623. URBAN VIII. favours France.			

Prosperous and Adverse Events	Ecclesiastical Decrees and Acts of Arbitrary Power	Doctrines of the Lutheran Church	Lutheran Theologians	Reformed Theologians	Doctrines of the Reformed Church	Separate Religious Communities	
1578. The protestants lose the right of public worship in Austria.	Severity of the Protestant German princes towards those who differed from them in opinion; of the Calvinists towards the Lutherans, and of the Lutherans towards the Calvinists.	1589. Crypto-Calvinists in Saxony.		1586. Colloq. at Mumpelgard.	fuse the form of creed, approach the doctrines of the reformed church in their opinions. 1582. Pretensions of the clergy and the synods in the United Netherlands.		1500
1598. Edict of Nantes.		Synod at Upsal.	Hutter.	Whitaker. Hospinian.			
Prosperous and Adverse Events	Ecclesiastical Decrees and Acts of Arbitrary Power	Doctrines of the Lutheran Church	Doctrines of the Reformed Church	Lutheran Theologians	Reformed Theologians	Separate Religious Communities	
Protestant Christianity in the foreign English and Dutch possessions. Threats against the Huguenots.	Edict of the elector of Brandenburg, giving the Reformed church like privileges with the Lutheran.	Controversy concerning the origin of sin. Tendency to Socinianism at Altorf. Controversy concerning <i>κρίσις</i> or <i>κένωσις</i> in Christ;	Arminian controversy.	Arndt.	Gomarus.	Independents	1600
1621. Protestants expelled from Bohemia; some put to death.		and concerning the 'internal word.'	1618. Council of Dort, at which the doctrines of the 'absolute decree of God' and 'free grace' were established.	Hoe of Hoenegg. Geo. Calixtus.	Grotius. Laud, bishop of London Blondel. Dallæus. Maresius.	Arminians. Episcopius. Jo. Crell. Socinus. Mennonites unite.	

Prosperous and Adverse Events	Ecclesiastical Decrees and Acts of Arbitrary Power	Doctrines of the Lutheran Church	Doctrines of the Reformed Church	Lutheran Theologians	Reformed Theologians	Separate Religious Communities	
1629. Siege of Rochelle. Edict of restitution in Germany.							1600
Irish massacre, 1641.	Puritans oppressed in England. The Puritans in possession of the chief power. 1645. Power of the synods in Holland restricted.	Continual controversies; the 'Syncretists;' whether Christ retained his human nature during the three days intervening between his death and resurrection; and concerning toleration of the Reformed church.	Controversy about the Cartesian philosophy. 1648. The Reformed church the third in importance in Germany.	Glassius.	Duracus. Amyraldus. Voet. Coccejus. Claude. Walton.	1638. Socinians driven from Racow. Political power of the Independents. Quakers and Baptists in England.	
Duke Ernest the Good, of Gotha. Activity of the English society for the diffusion of Christianity. Protestants oppressed in Hungary.	1660. Episcopacy introduced again into England; severe laws against the Nonconformists. Edict against the private religious meetings of the Pietists.	Consensus repetitæ fidei γρησις Lutheræ. Spencer's zeal for practical Christianity.	1675. Formula consensus Helveticæ. Bekker against superstition.	Calovius. Jo. Musesæus. A. II Franke. Carpzove.	1661. Colloq. at Cas-sel. Heidegger. Jurieu. Sancroft. Pajon. Vitringa	1660. Socinians expelled entirely from Poland. Gichtelians. Will. Penn distinguished amongst the Quakers; — in Pennsylvania entire religious freedom.	
1685. Edict of Nantes revoked. Palatinate governed by a Roman Catholic line of princes.	1689. Toleration Act.	Collegia pietatis. Numerous and violent disputes on the propositions of the Pietists, and subjects connected with them; and	Writings in England against the Naturalists.				

	Political Events	External History	Internal History	Remarkable Persons	Doctrines and Controversies	Monastic Institutions
1600	<p>Peter the Great.</p> <p>1697. Peace of Ryswick.</p>	<p>Christians in China.</p> <p>The elector of Saxony becomes Catholic.</p>	<p>the Synod held at Paris, for protecting the rights of the Gallican church.</p>			
1700	<p>1701. Frederick I., king of Prussia.</p> <p>War for the Spanish succession.</p> <p>Charles XII. of Sweden in Poland and Saxony.</p> <p>1705. JOSEPH I.</p> <p>1711. CHARLES VI.</p> <p>1713. Frederick William, king of Prussia.</p> <p>1714. George I., king of England.</p> <p>Peace of Rastadt.</p> <p>1715. Lewis XV., king of France.</p> <p>1725. Catherine I., empress of Russia.</p> <p>1727. George II., king of England.</p> <p>1740. Maria Theresa. Frederick the Great, of Prussia.</p> <p>1741. CHARLES VII. War for the succession to the throne of Austria.</p>	<p>Persecution of the Camisards in Cevennes.</p> <p>1709.—is forced to yield to the emperor, Spain, and the king of Sicily.</p> <p>Institutions of Peter the Great in Russia.</p> <p>Establishment of a holy synod in Russia.</p> <p>1721. INNOCENT XIII. at variance with Lucerne and Portugal.</p> <p>1730. Clement XII. at variance with Parma and Spain.</p> <p>1740. BENEDICT XIV.</p> <p>Religious freedom again in China.</p>	<p>CLEMENT XI. favours the French, but</p> <p>1709.—is forced to yield to the emperor, Spain, and the king of Sicily.</p> <p>Institutions of Peter the Great in Russia.</p> <p>Establishment of a holy synod in Russia.</p> <p>1721. INNOCENT XIII. at variance with Lucerne and Portugal.</p> <p>1730. Clement XII. at variance with Parma and Spain.</p> <p>1740. BENEDICT XIV.</p>	<p>Codde, apostol. vicar at Utrecht, loses his place as suspected of Jan-senism; is protected by the States General.</p> <p>Separation of the Catholics in the Netherlands from the Roman church. They assert the right of appeal to a general council.</p> <p><i>Muratori.</i></p> <p><i>Montfaucon.</i></p> <p><i>Hardouin.</i></p> <p>1717. Patriarch at Lisbon.</p> <p>Fleury, minister of France, and cardinal.</p> <p><i>Sabathier.</i></p> <p>Beaumont, archbishop of Paris . . .</p>	<p>Quesnel's N. Testament suspected of favouring Jansenism.</p> <p>1713. Bull <i>Unigenitus</i>, condemning Quesnel's New Testament.</p> <p>Continued controversy on this matter in France.</p> <p>he causes the certificates of confessional to be demanded from the dying.</p>	<p>Continued quarrels of the orders in China.</p>

Prosperous and Adverse Events	Ecclesiastical Decrees and Acts of Arbitrary Power	Doctrines of the Lutheran Church	Doctrines of the Reformed Church	Lutheran Theologians	Reformed Theologians	Separate Religious Communities	
	Presbyterian church in Scotland.	struggle of real or fanatical piety with a mere formal theology.		1695. University of Halle. Arnold.	Basnage.		1600
1705. Mission to Tranquebar. 1709. Scotch society for the diffusion of Christianity in the Highlands. 1714. <i>Colleg. de promov. evang.</i> amongst the Laplanders. 1725. The Protestants in the Palatinate oppressed, and the Dissidents in Poland. New persecution of the Huguenots in France. English mission to the East Indies. 1731. Emigration of the inhabitants of Salzburg. Calenberg. Institut. 1741. Rights of the Protestants in Silesia restored.	Edicts against the Pietists.	Continued controversy with the theologians at Halle. The philosophy of Wolf attacked by the theologians.	Controversy concerning Universalism and Particularism in Brandenburg and the Netherlands. Dispute concerning the Trinity. Controversies with the enemies of Christianity in England.	Attempts to unite with the Reformed Church. V. E. Löscher. Pfaff. S. Cyprian.	Le Clerc. Turretin. Saurin.	Separatists in Germany. Dispute amongst the Mennonites. The Unitarians in Transylvania oppressed. 1722. Origin of the Moravian brethren. Methodists.	1700
	Clergy removed from their places, as suspected of Socinianism.	Beginning of true theological learning in the Lutheran church.	Seceders in Scotland.	Mosheim.	Wetstein.		
				Baumgarten. Semler.	A. Schul-tens.		

Political Events	External History	Internal History	Remarkable Persons	Doctrines and Controversies	Monastic Institutions
1700 1748. Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle. 1756. Seven years' war.		'Breve' to put an end to the controversies in France. 1758. CLEMENT XIII. breaks with several courts.	Mansi.		A storm breaks upon the Jesuits in Paraguay; they are expelled from several countries.
1760. George III., king of England. 1762. Catherine II., empress of Russia. 1765. JOSEPH II. 1767. Confederation in Poland.		1769. CLEMENT XIV. yielding towards the courts of Europe.	v. Hontheim. (Febron.)		
1772. First partition of Poland. 1774. Lewis XVI. of France. Independence of the United States of America.		1775. Prussia VI. 1781. Reforms of the emperor Joseph in Austria; bounds set to the papal power.	Papal nuncios in Germany. De Rossi. Charles Theodore of Rosenberg.	1781. Joseph forbids the processions, and other superstitious abuses.	1773. The pope abolishes the Jesuit order. Many convents abolished in Austria.
1786. Fred. William II. of Prussia.		1788. Naples refuses the feudal contribution to the pope.	Gregory, bishop of Blois. Royko.		
1789. French revolution.	France without religion.				
1790. LEOPOLD II. 1792. FRANCIS II. Further partition of Poland. 1797. Fred. William III. of Prussia.		1794. The decrees of the council of Pistoia condemned by the pope.			1790. All monastic orders abolished in France.
1799. Maximilian, elector of Bavaria. Napoleon Buonaparte, consul.		1800. Prussia VII.	J. Jahn.	Reformation in Bavaria.	Monastic life much modified in Switzerland.

Prosperous and Adverse Events	Ecclesiastical Decrees and Acts of Arbitrary Power	Doctrines of the Lutheran Church	Doctrines of the Reformed Church	Lutheran Theologians	Reformed Theologians	Separate Religious Communities
						1700
		Free theological investigation.		Ernesti.	Breitinger.	
		Controversy concerning the canon, the symbolical books, &c.	Controversies concerning the necessity of subscribing to the 39 Articles.	Fr. Walch.	Lowth.	
Emperor Joseph's 'Act of tolerance.'	1775. Synods in Poland to arrange the form of church government.			A. Teller.		
1787. Rights of the Huguenots in France restored.	1778. Prussian religious edict.			J. D. Michaelis.		
Religious freedom in France.	Assemblies of the episcopal church in North America.	New controversies concerning the relation of philosophy to religion.		Noesselt.		
				Doederlein.	Lavater.	
				Griesbach.		
				Morus.		
				Eichhorn.		
				Storr.	Zollikofer.	The emperor confirms the rights of the Unitarians in Transylvania.
				Knapp.		
				Niemeyer.		
New missionary societies in England and Holland.						

Political Events	External History	Internal History	Remarkable Persons	Doctrines and Controversies	Monastic Institutions
<p>1800</p> <p>1801. ALEXANDER, emperor of Russia.</p> <p>1804. NAPOLEON BONA-PARTE.</p> <p>1805. Peace of St. Petersburg.</p> <p>1807. Peace of Tilsit.</p> <p>1809. War between Austria and France.</p> <p>1810. Peace of Vienna.</p> <p>1814. Peace of Paris. Congress at Vienna.</p> <p>1815. Battle of Waterloo.</p> <p>1816. Confederacy of the German powers.</p> <p>1820. George IV., king of England.</p> <p>Cortes in Spain.</p> <p>Rising of the Greeks.</p> <p>Ferdinand VII. restored.</p> <p>1824. Charles X., king of France.</p> <p>1830. William IV., king of England.</p> <p>Lewis-Philip, king of the French.</p> <p>1837. Victoria, queen of England.</p> <p>1840. Frederick William IV., king of Prussia.</p> <p>1848. Lewis-Philip driven from France: which becomes a republic.</p> <p>1852. Lewis-Napoleon Bonaparte emperor of France.</p>	<p>Religion re-stored in France.</p> <p>The <i>seminar. Paris. pro missione</i> re-established.</p> <p>Persecutions in China.</p> <p>1828. Test Act repealed in England.</p> <p>1829. Romish disabilities removed in England.</p> <p>Quarrels between Prussia and Rome on mixed marriages.</p>	<p>Papal 'concordat' with France.</p> <p>Church government in Russia.</p> <p>Napoleon crowned by the pope at Paris.</p> <p>The papal dominions divided between the kingdom of Italy and France,—the pope in France, and then again in Italy.</p> <p>The pope in Savona.</p> <p>Papal dominions restored to Pius VII.</p> <p>Concordat with Bavaria, Sicily, Prussia, Hanover,</p> <p>Papal diocese in Switzerland also.</p> <p>In Spain the old church government.</p> <p>1839. Return of the Uniats to the Russian church.</p> <p>1848. The pope flees from Rome.</p> <p>1850. Return of the pope to Rome.</p>	<p>Card. Caprara in Frand.</p> <p><i>Leonh. Hug.</i></p> <p>Card. Fesh.</p> <p>Philaret and Eugenii in Russia.</p> <p>Card. Gonsalvi.</p> <p>Broglio, bishop of Ghent.</p> <p>Dahlberg.</p> <p>1823. LEO XII.</p> <p>1829. PIUS VIII.</p> <p>1831. GREGORY XVI.</p> <p>1846. PIUS IX.</p>	<p>Liturgy improved in Roman Catholic Germany.</p> <p>Papal decree against the Bible Societies.</p> <p>Strict censorship of the press at Rome.</p>	<p>Jesuits still in Russia.</p> <p>More convents thrown open.</p> <p>Inquisition abolished in Spain and Italy.</p> <p>Bible Society at St. Petersburg.</p> <p>Order of Jesuits revived; cloisters re-established.</p> <p>Miracles of prince Hohenlohe.</p> <p>Pope orders a year of jubilee.</p>

Prosperous and Adverse Events	Ecclesiastical Decrees and Acts of Arbitrary Power	Doctrines of the Lutheran Church	Doctrines of the Reformed Church	Lutheran Theologians	Reformed Theologians	Separate Religious Communities	
New restrictions on the Protestants in Hungary.	Protestant consistories in France.		1804. Great Bible Society in London. Bible Societies universal.	Planck. Paulus. Staeudlin.	Muen-scher. Arnoldi.	New Methodists. 1802. Society called Christo-Sacrum at Delft, in Holland. Union of the Presbyterian Independents and Baptists in England for the government of the churches.	1800
Diffusion of Christianity in East India and the South Sea Islands.	1817. Mutual synods.	Tendency to enthusiasm in religion and mysticism. The extremes of Rationalism and Supernaturalism. Lutheran and Reformed church united; also in the celebration of the jubilee for the Reformation.		J. E. C. Schmidt	Marsh.		
The Roman Catholic church active in making proselytes, and intolerant.	1818. Rights of the Protestants in Bavaria secured. 1823. General synod in Bavaria. 1824. Religious edict in Baden.	Reaction against Rationalism.		De Wette. Gese-nius. Bretsch-neider. Teschir-ner.	Schlei-ermacher. Schult-hess.	1833. Theological movement at Oxford.	
	1850. Papal aggression in England.					1843. The Free church of Scotland. 1844. The German Catholic church.	
	1854. The Immaculate Conception made an article of faith.					1852. Convocation of the Church of England resumes action.	

INDEX.

ADA

ABASGI, conversion of the, i. 389
 — Abbo of St. Germain, i. 549
 — of Fleury, i. 591
 Abbot, abp., iii. 296, 363, 395
 Abbots, number of, in the Scottish parliament, iii. 93
 Abbuna, i. 429; iii. 297
 Abdallah, i. 527
 Abdalrahman, i. 525
 Abdas, i. 326
 Abelard, ii. 126
 Abelites, i. 150
 Abgarus, legend of, i. 33
 Abrams, Nicholas, iii. 264
 Abraxas, i. 145
 Abridgments, evil of, i. 589
 Absalom of St. Victor, ii. 219
 — of Lund, ii. 90
 Abubeker, i. 445
 Abulpharagius, ii. 172
Abuna. See Abbuna
 Abyssinia, conversion of, i. 232; Romish mission to, ii. 508; papal reverses in, iii. 247
 Abyssinian church, the, ii. 545
 Abyssinians, adoption of monophysite opinions by, i. 429
 Acacians, i. 306
 Acacius, i. 332, 377
 — of Cæsarea, i. 255
 — of Beroea, i. 342
 — of Melitene, *ib.*
 — of Constantinople, i. 343
 Academics, principles of, i. 19
 Acca, ii. 501
Accord, the, ii. 485
Acephali, the, i. 377, 408
 Achamoth, i. 148, 408, 421
 Achigian, iii. 300
 Acindynus, ii. 287
Acemeta, order of, i. 360
 Acolytes, i. 170
 Acropolita, George, ii. 213
 Act of settlement, iii. 419
Acta Martyrum, i. 46
 Active obedience, iii. 382
 Adalbert, i. 515
 — of Pomerania, ii. 90
 — of Prague, ii. 4
 Adam, the book of, ii. 549
 — Scotus, ii. 133

AFR

Adamannus, i. 456
 Adamites, i. 150; ii. 363
 Adamson, Patrick, sermon of, when Abp. Douglas was inaugurated, iii. 69; appointed primate, 79; resists the general assembly, 83; manages the presbyterians with dexterity, 86, 90; excommunicated by the synod of Fife, 92; persists in opposing the kirk, 96; marries Huntly, *ib.*; signs some recantation, 97; dies, *ib.*
 Adamus, Magister, ii. 53
 — Goddamus, ii. 294
 Adelaide, i. 585
 Adelbold, ii. 51
 Adelphians, the, i. 317
 Adelphius, i. 197
 Ademar, ii. 51
 Adiaphoristic controversy, the, ii. 575
Admonition, Allen's, iii. 47
 Ado, i. 546
 Adolphus, John, duke of Holstein, iii. 347
 Adoptionists, i. 517
 Adrevaldus, i. 550
 Adrian, the Emperor, general character of, i. 93; persecution under, 103; yet he was thought inclinable to Christianity, 104; prohibits the Jews from entering Jerusalem, 139
 — abbot, ii. 77, 78
 — author of an introduction to Scripture, i. 348
Edesius, i. 237
Egeates, i. 343
Egidius Carlerius, ii. 345
 — de Colonna, ii. 218
Ælfric, i. 604
Ælia Capitolina, i. 102
Ælnoth, ii. 129
Emilianus, Jerome, ii. 520
Eneas of Paris, i. 548
 — Gazæus, i. 343
 — Sylvius, ii. 330, 346
Æons, i. 54
Ærius, i. 279
Ætians, i. 306
Ætius of Syria, i. 256
 — i. 307
 Affelmann, iii. 319, 342
 Affre, archbp., iii. 579
 Africa, Romish missions to, iii. 201

AGA

- Agapæ*, i. 80; abolished, 360
Agapetus, i. 407, 416
Agathias, i. 393
Agatho, pope, i. 456, 467
Agde, council of, i. 402
Agenda, iii. 599
Aghtamar, ii. 547
Agilulph, i. 395
Agnoëtæ, i. 430
Agobard, i. 543, 574
Agricola, Rudolph, ii. 348
— John, ii. 572
Agrippa Castor, i. 123
Aguirre, iii. 268
Ahriman, i. 201
Aidan, i. 439
Aids, congregations on the, ii. 537
Ailred of Bevesby, ii. 132
Aimoin, i. 546; ii. 54
Aistulphus, i. 490
Aix-la-Chapelle, council of, i. 561
Ἀκομῆτοι, i. 360
Alain de l'Isle (de Insulis), ii. 174
Alan de Insulis, ii. 132
Alani, conversion of, i. 389
Alans, conversion of, i. 321
Alanus ab Insulis, ii. 215, 229
Albanensians, ii. 149
Alberic of Aix, ii. 130
— ii. 52
Albert Crantz, ii. 351
— the Great, ii. 177
— of Livonia, ii. 91
— of Stade, ii. 221
— of Padua, ii. 294
Albertinus Mussatus, *ib.*
Albertus de Arsentina, ii. 297
Albertus Magnus, ii. 215
Albicius, ii. 296
Albigenses, date of the name, ii. 70; particulars of, 238; crusades against, 239; in century X., i. 612
Albini, ii. 275
Albion, i. 479
Alciat, Jo. Paul, iii. 166, 167
Alcimus Aritus, i. 349
Alcoran of the Franciscans, ii. 276
Alcuin, particulars of, i. 500; visit to England, 512; writes against images, *ib.*
Aldhelm, i. 454
Alexander Severus favourably disposed towards the Christians, i. 158; yet the cause of persecution, 161; thinks erroneously of Christ, 165
— bishop of Jerusalem, i. 180
— of Hierapolis, i. 342
— of Lycopolis, i. 393
— de Villa Dei, ii. 176
— de St. Elpidio, ii. 293
— of Alexandria, i. 225, 293
Alexander II., ii. 27
Alexander III., ii. 103, 113, 117, 133, 141
— IV., ii. 187
— VI., ii. 313, 332, 358
— VII., iii. 227, 253, 280

ANA

- Alexander* VIII., iii. 228
Alexandria, school of, i. 74; council of, i. 296, 367, 464; patriarch of, iii. 567
Alexandrinus Codex, sent to England, iii. 296.
Alexius Aristenus, ii. 125
— Comnenus, ii. 7, 69
— of Constantinople, ii. 48
—, St., brethren of, ii. 285
Alfred patronised learning, i. 528
Alger of Liege, ii. 131
Algrin, ii. 220
Ali, i. 445
Alitophilus, ii. 198
Allatius, iii. 270
Allegorical expositions of Scripture, i. 187, 504
Allen, the Irish Jesuit, iii. 129
— cardinal, iii. 47, 48
All Saints'-day, institution of, i. 460
Almain, ii. 351
Al Mamun, i. 527
Alphanus, ii. 52
Alphonso, king of Castile, ii. 67
Altars, increase of, ii. 146
— removed from English churches, ii. 449
Alto, i. 479
Alva, duke of, ii. 438
Alvarus, i. 548
— Pelagius, ii. 295, 301
Amadeus of Lausanne, ii. 132
Amalaricus, i. 538, 547, 564, 570
Amalphi, ii. 104
Amauri de Béne, ii. 244
Amboise, peace of, iii. 17
Amboyna, Dutch missions in, iii. 201
Ambrose, account of, i. 257; conduct of, in the case of Gervasius and Protasius, 270
— Authpert, i. 500
— of Camalduli, ii. 317, 340
America, discovery of, ii. 312
— division of, between the Spaniards and Portuguese, *ib.*
—, Romish missions in, iii. 202, 203
American church, iii. 528, 529, 624
Americus Vespuccius, ii. 312
Ames, William, iii. 39, 353
Amling, Wolfgang, iii. 98
Ammianus Marcellinus, i. 230
Ammonius, i. 180, 188
— Saccas, i. 110
Amphilochia, i. 553
Amphilochius of Iconium, i. 253
Ampulla Rhemensis, i. 322
Amsdorf, Nicholas, ii. 576
Amulo, i. 548
Amyrant, iii. 239
Amyrant, Moses, iii. 353, 357
Anabaptists, ii. 426; iii. 136
Anagnosta, ii. 338
Anagogical sense of Scripture, i. 187, 504
Anania, John, ii. 345
Anastasia, i. 263
Anastasius of St. Euthymium, i. 501
— Sinaita, i. 407
— Bibliothecarius, i. 549
— i. 428, 455, 509, 510

ANA

Anastasius IV. ii. 112, 133
 — his prohibition of pagan shows, i. 321
 Anatolius, bishop of Laodicea, i. 181
 Anaxagoras, i. 12
 Ancharanus, ii. 344
 Anchialus, Michael, ii. 102
 Anchorites, i. 274
 Ancient theologists, ii. 138—140
 Ancrianus, ii. 297
 Andebert, iii. 239
 Andree, James, iii. 341
 — iii. 319
 Andreas, ii. 348
 — de Petra, ii. 338
 — of Crete, i. 452
 — of Cæsarea, i. 344
 — John, ii. 251
 — Samosatensis, i. 342
 Andrew, king of Hungary, ii. 164
 — of Newcastle, ii. 292
 Andrew's, St., siege of, ii. 470; iii. 18; the cathedral destroyed, ii. 477
 — archbps. of, ii. 597
 Andriadius, ii. 523
 Andronicus, ii. 124
 Angel, as applied to a bishop, i. 62
 Angelome, i. 555
 Angelomus, i. 549
 Angelus de Clavasio, ii. 348
 Angers, school of, ii. 103
 Anglerius, ii. 351
 Anglo-Saxons, arrival of, in England, i. 326
 Anglus, Thomas, iii. 291
 Angrogne, Waldensian council at, iii. 28
 Anhalt, princes of, iii. 28
 Anicetus, pope, conference of, with Polycarp, i. 136
 Annates, ii. 263
 Anne, Queen, iii. 528
 Annexation, act of, iii. 92
 Annunciation, feast of, i. 426
 Ansegius, i. 548
 Anselm, ii. 18, 50, 57
 — of Havelburg, ii. 132
 — of Liege, ii. 52
 — of Lucca, *ib.*
 — of Laon, ii. 125
 Ansgarius, i. 520
 Anthimus, i. 410
 Anthony, St., works of, i. 255; date of his monastic regulations, 272
 — order of, ii. 46
 Anthropomorphites, i. 316, 339, 378, 612
 Antichrist, expectation of, i. 605
 Antidico-Marianites, i. 318
 Antinomians, the, ii. 373
 — iii. 378
 Antioch, patriarchs of, ii. 539; patriarchate of, iii. 567
 Antiochus, i. 452, 458
 Antipædobaptists, iii. 157
 Antipas, i. 22
 Antonines, the, i. 95
 Antoninus, the Philosopher, persecution under, i. 105

ARC

Antoninus Pius, equitable decree of, i. 93, 104
 — of Florence, ii. 342
 — Marcus, qualified favour to Christianity of, i. 103; philosophical principles of, 108
 Antonius Andreas, ii. 290
 — de Balacho, ii. 349
 — de Padua, ii. 220
 — Melissa, ii. 125
 Antony, Paul, iii. 331, 334
 — St., i. 272
 Aones, i. 273
 Apelles, i. 143
 Aphonius, i. 456
 Aphthartodocetæ, i. 430
 Apocryphal books, particulars of, i. 66; decree against, 354
 Apollinarian system, i. 254
 Apollinarians, i. 308
 Apollinaris, i. 254, 308
 — bishop of Hierapolis, works of, i. 123
 Apollonius, a Roman senator, and martyr, *ib.*
 — a Greek writer against the Cataphrygians, *ib.*
 — Tyanæus, i. 165, 229
 Apologies, the, for Christianity, i. 98
 — the, utility of, *ib.*
 Apology, Jewel's, ii. 460
 — for the Augsburg Confession, ii. 422
 Apostle, meaning of the term, i. 51
 Apostles, sect of the, ii. 246
 — the choice of, i. 32; the name given to confidential persons about the high priests, 33; labours and deaths of, 36; alleged services of, in converting the European nations, 38; dates of such accounts, *ib.*; probable degrees of truth in them, *ib.*; extraordinary teachers, 85
 Apostolic fathers, i. 68; sees, ancient deference for, 63; canons and constitutions, 67, 190; creed, 71; clerks, ii. 284
 Apostolical churches, origin of the term, i. 72
 — nuncio, ii. 507
 Apostolici, ii. 158
 Apostool, Samuel, iii. 459
 Apostoolians, *ib.*
 Apotactics, i. 288
 Appion, i. 123
 Aquaspartanus, ii. 204
 Aquaviva, iii. 275
 Aquilinus, i. 197
 Aquinas, Thomas, ii. 177, 216, 225; his doctrine of indulgences, 137
 Arabian tribe, conversion of an, i. 161
 — sect, the, i. 207
 Arabians partly converted to Christianity, i. 321; learning of, 527
 Arabianus, i. 123, 126
 Arabic instructors sought, i. 593
 Arator, i. 412
 Arbriscelles, Robert of, ii. 121
 Arcadius, i. 319
 Arcani disciplina, i. 74
 Archæus, iii. 218
 Archelaus, Herod's son, i. 22
 — bishop of Carrhæ, i. 181
 Arch-priest, appointment of, iii. 392

ARC

- Archytas compared with Christ, i. 165
 Arcimbald, deprived of money collected in Denmark by the sale of indulgences, ii. 413
 Ardo, i. 548
 Arethas, i. 410
 Aretinus, Leonard, ii. 344
 Arevallo, de, ii. 347
 Argyropulus, ii. 339
 Argyrus, ii. 289
 Arianism, nature of, i. 295; divisions in, 307; becomes a sectarian distinction, 313
 Arians, the, persecute the catholics, i. 363; alleged miracle to confute them, *ib.*; dispersion of, 427; existence of, in cent. X., 613
 Aribo, i. 502
 Arifostus, ii. 71
 Arimathea, alleged mission of Joseph of, to Britain, i. 97
 Aristides, i. 104, 123
 Aristotelian philosophy adopted by the Jesuits, ii. 522
 — defective views of the Deity in the, i. 19
 Aristotle, rising popularity of, i. 330; introduced into France, ii. 18; exclusively studied in cent. XIII., 176; some of his works condemned, *ib.*; extravagantly extolled in cent. XIV., 317
 Aristotle's Dialectics translated into Syriac, i. 447
 Arius, i. 293, 297, 300, 301, 302
 Arles, council of, i. 290
 Armagh, Romish synod of, iii. 402
 — see of, deprived of the primacy, iii. 113; restored to it, 115; the cathedral destroyed, 123
 — list of archbps. of, i. 622; ii. 598; iii. 631
 Armand of Bellevue, ii. 218
 Armenia, conversion of, i. 232
 Armenian church, the, ii. 547, 565, 571
 Armenians, intercourse of, with Rome, ii. 509
 — state of, in cent. XVII., iii. 302
Armilla Aurea, iii. 394
 Arminians, condemned at Dort, iii. 425; prejudged, *ib.*; persecuted and exiled, 428; settle in Holstein, *ib.*; recalled, *ib.*; set up a famous school, *ib.*; their system, 430; their confession, 431; their present state, 432
 Arminius, iii. 354, 355, 395, 420, 421, 429
 Arnaldus, ii. 533
 Arnaud, Anthony, ii. 533
 Arnould, Anthony, iii. 266, 272, 277, 280, 28
 Arnd, iii. 319, 322, 343
 Arndt, John, ii. 564
 Arnobius, i. 179, 188
 — junior, i. 347
 Arnold of Villa Nova, ii. 178
 — of Brescia, ii. 153
 — of Hildesheim, ii. 219
 — Carnotensis, ii. 133
 — Godfrey, iii. 337
 — William, iv. 489
 Arnoldists, ii. 154
 Arnulph of Laon, ii. 19
 — of Luxen, ii. 132
 Arran, earl of, iii. 84, 87, 90, 91

AUT

- Arras, council of, ii. 73
 Arsenius, ii. 413
 Artemas, i. 152
 Artemon, i. 152, 153
 Article, the Seventeenth, iii. 29
 Articles, the Thirty-nine, established, ii. 464
 — the Forty-two, ii. 450
 Arts, seven liberal, i. 485; ii. 17
 Ascension, festival of the, i. 460
 Ascetic, i. 273
 — principles, rise of, i. 129
 Ascoli, bishop of, iii. 41
 Ascunage, i. 431
 Assembly, the Westminster, iii. 374
 Asser, i. 550
 Association, Catholic, iii. 549
 Asterius, i. 255, 341
 Astesanus, ii. 292, 301
 Astrology, passion for, ii. 259
 Asylum, privilege of, i. 461
 — French, at Rome, contest respecting, iii. 255, 256
 Atabec Zenghi, ii. 94
 Athanaric, i. 234
 Athanasian Creed, probable origin of, i. 347
 Athanasius, bishop of Rome, i. 183
 — junior, i. 343
 — account of, i. 247, 269, 303
 Atheism charged upon Christianity, i. 133
 Athenagoras, *Apology* of, i. 105; philosophical partialities of, 109; history of, 120
 Athingias, i. 575
 Atterbury, bishop, iii. 500
 Atticus of Constantinople, i. 341
 Atto of Vercelli, i. 602
 Attrition, ii. 524; iii. 271
 Aubespine, iii. 268
 Audians, i. 315, 316
 Audoenus, i. 455
 Audœus, i. 315
 Augsburg, confession of, ii. 411, 418, 419; iii. 229; peace of, 233
 Augustine, St., account of, i. 260; complains of the multitude of ceremonies, 282; reason of his treatise *De Civ. Dei*, 321; monastic services of, 336; intent upon crushing the Donatists, 362, 363; an authority for persecution, *ib.*; opposes Pelagius, 382, 383, 385
 — mission of, to England, i. 391, 434, 437; death, 438
 — St., regular canons of, ii. 47
 Augustinians, ii. 218; iii. 282, 488
Augustinus, the book, iii. 276
 — Triumphus, ii. 222
 — Patricius, ii. 348
 Augustulus, i. 319
 Augustus, i. 11
 Aurelian, i. 164
 Aurelius of Carthage, i. 265
 Aureolus, Peter, ii. 290
 Ausonius, i. 236
 Austria, church in, iii. 581
 Austrian protestants, oppression of, iii. 229
 Autbert, i. 520
 Autharis, ii. 395

AUT

- Autherlus, iii. 185
 Author, account of the, i. 1
Αὐτοκέφαλοι, i. 241
 Auxilius, i. 550
Ave Maria added to the prayers, ii. 304
 Aventinus, ii. 352
 Averroes, i. 529
 Avicenna, i. 528
 Avignon, transfer of the papal court to, ii. 263;
 bought, 267
 Avitus, i. 349
 Azyzo, i. 273

BABACUS, i. 372

- Babylon, applied to the Lutheran church,
 iii. 333
 — Rome called by Lewis XII. ii. 374
Babylonian Captivity, ii. 263
 Bacon, John, ii. 290
 — Francis, Lord Verulam, iii. 233
 — Roger, ii. 140, 176, 178, 179, 218
 Bactria, conversion of, i. 473
 Baden, church in, iii. 580, 594
 Bagnolo, ii. 149
 Bahnsen, iii. 345
 Baiolensians, ii. 149
 Baius, ii. 523, 535
 Balbus, John, ii. 176
 Baldensel, ii. 295
 Balderic, ii. 53
 Baldric of Dol, ii. 130
 Baldus, ii. 257
 Baldwin, ii. 8
 — of Canterbury, ii. 134
 — count of Flanders, made emperor of the
 Greeks, ii. 163
 — Frederic, iii. 317, 342
 Bale, bishop, iii. 114
 Balsamon, ii. 124
 Baluze, iii. 269
 Bancroft, archbishop, principles of, iii. 20; ser-
 vices of, 393, 394
 Bangorian controversy, iii. 501
 Baptism, primitive mode of administering, i. 81;
 ancient usages connected with, 134; primi-
 tive administration of, 137, 286; that of
 heretics, 192; innovations in the administra-
 tion of, 195; usages respecting, in cent. III.,
 196; administration of, in cent. IV., 286; ad-
 ministration of, in cent. VII., 425; times for
 administering, *ib.*; second, 458; administra-
 tion of, in cent. XII., ii. 90; administered at
 all seasons in that cent., 146
 Baptist, St. John the, i. 32
 Baptista Mantuanus, ii. 351
 — Trovamala, ii. 348
 — Salvia, ii. 348
Baptisteria, i. 286
 Baptists, English, iii. 156, 460; general, 157;
 particular, *ib.*; seventh day, 157
 Baradæus, James, i. 378
Baratators, ii. 169
 Barbarossa, Frederic, ii. 96, 113
 Barbatus, ii. 347

DEC

- Barbeyrac, charges against the Fathers by, i.
 127, 128
 Bar-Cochebas, insurrection under, i. 101
 Barclay, Robert, iii. 436
 Barcos, Martin de, iii. 259, 283
 Bardas, i. 526
 Bardesanes, i. 123, 144
 Barlaam, ii. 255, 305
 Barlaamites, ii. 305
 Bar-le-Duc, synod of, iii. 361
 Barletta, ii. 347
 Barmamas, ii. 509
 Barnabas, election of, i. 34; epistle of, 69, 70
 Barnabites, ii. 520
 Barnes, Robert, employed at Smalcald, ii. 425;
 particulars of him, *ib.*
 Baronius, a pupil of Noësius, ii. 520; his *Annals*,
 iii. 266
 Barre, Nicholas, iii. 262
 Barrington, bishop, iii. 557
 Barrow, iii. 55, 62
 — Isaac, iii. 223
 Barsanuphites, i. 378
 Barsanuphius, i. 411
Barsopa, i. 372
 Barsumus of Nisibus, i. 371
 — the abbot, i. 376
 Bartholomew, St., supposed mission of, i. 95
 — of Urbino, ii. 295
 — of St. Concordia, ii. 294, 301
 — St., massacre of, iii. 17
 Bartolus, ii. 251
 Basil of Ancyra, i. 307, 501
 — Achridenus, ii. 125
 — of Cilicia, i. 343
 — the Great, account of, i. 248; monastic ser-
 vices of, 336
 — the Bogomile, burnt, ii. 147
 — of Thessalonica, i. 452
 — the Macedonian, i. 523, 526, 540
 — of Seleucia, i. 340
 — council of, ii. 327
Basilicon Doron, iii. 105
 Basilides, i. 145; iii. 247
 — John, ii. 552
 Basnage, iii. 244
 Bassi, Matthew de, ii. 518
 Bassolis, John, ii. 294
 Bastide, la, iii. 239
 Batavia, conversion of, i. 436
 Bavarians, conversion of, i. 391, 474
 Baxter, liturgy prepared by, iii. 404; petition
 for peace by, *ib.*
 Bayer, Christian, ii. 418
 Bayle, iii. 224, 487
 Beaton, cardinal, ii. 461, 470
 Beatus, i. 502
 Beaugendre, iii. 265
 Beaulieu, iii. 241
 Bebelius, ii. 349
 Becan, ii. 295
 — Martin, iii. 267
 Bechmann, iii. 320
 Becker, iii. 222, 387, 388, 389
 Becket, archbishop, ii. 114, 116

BEC

Beens, ii. 213
 Bede, particulars of, ii. 198
 Bedingfield, col., iii. 200
 Begga, St., ii. 211
Beghardi, ii. 208, 212
Beghards, ii. 73, 206
Beghines, ii. 216
Beguinae, ii. 212
Beguines, ii. 211
Beguini, ii. 208, 211
 Beguins, great persecution of, ii. 308
Beguttæ, ii. 210
 Behm, iii. 328
 Belgic protestantism, iii. 25; confession, *ib.*
 — revolution, iv. 485
 Belgium, church in, iii. 584
 Bellarmin, Robert, ii. 529; iii. 266
 Bellator, i. 419, 420
 Bells, baptism of, forbidden, i. 514
 Benard, iii. 262
 Benchenstein, iii. 25
 Benedict of Aniane, i. 537, 547
 — of Nursia, i. 403, 405
 — II., i. 449, 456
 — III., pope, i. 548
 — VIII., ii. 22
 — IX., ii. 22
 — XI., ii. 262
 — XII., ii. 266, 294
 — XIII., ii. 269
 — XIV., i. 610
 Benedictine rule, i. 404, 405
 — system, introduction of, into England, ii. 81, 82
 Benedictus, Jac. de, ii. 292
 Benetus, ii. 352
 Benno, ii. 53
 Berchorius, ii. 296
 Berengarius, ii. 61; opinions of, *ib.*; death, 64
 Berengosus, ii. 130
 Bermudez, ii. 508
 Bern, imposture at, ii. 378
 Bernard of Clairvaux, ii. 125
 — ii. 95, 119, 120; opposes the scholastic theology, 141
 Bernardin Samson, ii. 394
 Bernardine order, ii. 119
 Bernardinus Aquilinus, ii. 348
 — de Bustis, ii. 348
 — Senensis, ii. 343
 — Tomitanus, ii. 348
 Berno, ii. 51
 Bernouilli, iii. 213
 Bertha, i. 438
 Bertharius, i. 546, 554
 Berthold, ii. 52, 91
 Bertius, iii. 245
 Bertrand, Peter, ii. 294
 — de Turre, ii. 293
 — cardinal, ii. 282
 Berulle, iii. 260
 Beryllus, i. 206
 Besoldus, iii. 245
 Bessarion, ii. 317, 329, 337
 Beza, New Testament of, iii. 37

BON

Beza, intolerance of, ii. 238
 Beziers, Peter of, ii. 204
 Bible, Genevan, ii. 472
 — the *Breeches*, *ib.*
 — first divided into chapters, ii. 215
Biblical divines, ii. 226
 — Bachelors, ii. 528
 — colleges, iii. 332
Bicornæ, ii. 241
 Biddle, John, iii. 464
 Biel, Gabriel, ii. 343
 Bill of Rights, iii. 418
 Birinus, i. 441
 Birth of Jesus, manner of, controverted, i. 567
 Bishops and abbots, number of, in the Scottish parliament, iii. 93
 — popularly elected in primitive times, i. 115
 — primitive, i. 60, 62, 168
 — rural, i. 63
Bizochi, ii. 206
Black acts, the, iii. 88
 Black friars, ii. 195
 Blackburne, iii. 511
 Blacklo, iii. 291
 Blackwell, iii. 293
 Blanc, Lewis le, iii. 360
 Blandrata, iii. 166, 167, 175, 176
 Blastares, ii. 287
 Blastus, i. 141
 Blastus, i. 150
 Blesdyck, iii. 158
 Blessed Virgin, fraternity of, ii. 191
 Blondus, Flavius, ii. 346
 Blood of Christ, worship of, ii. 359
 Blount, Charles, iii. 209
 Blum, iii. 246
 Bobolenus, i. 456
Bocasoti, ii. 208
 Bockholt, John, ii. 426
 Bodin, John, ii. 499
 Boehmen, iii. 217, 343
 Boesius, iii. 339
 Boethius, i. 397, 414
 Boetius, Henry, iii. 342
 Bogards, ii. 212
 Bogermann, iii. 427
 Bogomiles, ii. 147
 Bogoris, i. 522
 Bohemia converted, i. 521; Lutherans in, ii. 418
 Bohemian brethren, iii. 27
 Bohemians, conversion of, i. 391
 Boleslaus, ii. 4
 Bolingbroke, lord, anecdote of, i. 54
 Bolland, iii. 268
 Bologna, school of, ii. 103; transfer of the council to, from Trent, ii. 431
 Bolsec, Jerome, iii. 41
 Bongratia, ii. 279
 Bona, cardinal, iii. 269
 Bonaventura, ii. 200, 216
 — Baduarius, ii. 297
 Boncarius, ii. 133
 Boner, Edmund, writes against the papacy, ii. 444; deprived, 451

BON

Bonfinius, ii. 350
 Bonfrere, iii. 268
 Bonhald, iii. 25
Boni Homines, ii. 70
 Boniface, pope, i. 347
 — complains of Adalbert and Clement, i. 515
 — mission of, i. 474, 476
 — II., i. 416
 — III., alleged privilege gained by, from Phocas, i. 448
 — IV., i. 455
 — V., *ib.*
 — VIII., ii. 179, 182, 190, 222, 261, 264
 — IX., ii. 269
 Bonifacius Simoneta, ii. 350
 Bonosus, i. 318
Bons Garçons, ii. 212
 — *Valets*, *ib.*
Book of Sports, the, iii. 398
 Borgia, Roderic, ii. 332; Cæsar, *ib.*
 Boromeo, Charles, canonised, iii. 293
 Bossius, ii. 349
 Bossuet, disputes with Claude, iii. 238; his *Exposition*, 239; *Variations*, 249; *Defence of the Gallican Liberties*, 255; particulars of, 269; confutes Mad. Guion, 290
 Bost, iii. 600.
 Bostonus, Buriensis, ii. 343
Bougres, ii. 70
 Boulainvilliers, count, iii. 212
 Bound, Dr., iii. 56
 Bourbon, Charles de, takes Rome, ii. 408
 — Anne Genevieve de, iii. 281, 282
 Bourignon, iii. 468
 Bourne, Richard, iii. 205
 Bonsardus, ii. 349
 Boyd, abp., iii. 74, 78, 83
 Boyle, Robert, iii. 206, 213, 223; his lecture founded, 206
 Bradwardine, abp., ii. 251
 Braganza, John, duke of, iii. 251
 Bramhall, appointed archbishop of Armagh, iii. 406; his expedient to reconcile presbyterians to re-ordination, 407
 Brandenburg, secession of, from Lutheranism, iii. 306
 Brandolinus, ii. 349
 Braschi, iii. 491
 Braulio, i. 455
 Breakspear, Nicholas, ii. 113
 Breckling, iii. 345
 Breitenburg, *ib.*
 Bremen, introduction of Calvinism into, iii. 14
 Bresty, convention of, ii. 552
 Brethren of the free Spirit, ii. 73
Bretwalda, i. 438
 Bridget, St., ii. 296
 Brihtwald, ii. 79
 Brissonet, ii. 416
 Bristol, bishopric, ii. 87
 Britain, probably converted from Asia Minor, i. 438; its conversion early, 95
 Brito, William, ii. 174
 Brocardus, ii. 221
 Bromley, Thomas, iii. 470

CAJ

Brompton, John, ii. 134
 Bronyard, John, ii. 297
 Brother Weavers, ii. 212
 Brown, abp., ii. 436; iii. 113, 115
 Browne, Robert, iii. 54
 Brownism, *ib.*
 Brownists, iii. 24
 Bruce, influence of, iii. 94; crowns the queen, 95
 Bruis, Peter, rejected infant baptism, iii. 138
 Brulifer, ii. 343
 Bruno, ii. 4
 — of Würzburg, ii. 51
 Brunos, the two, ii. 50
 Brunus, Jordan, ii. 500
 Bruys, Peter de, ii. 150, 151
 Bryennius, ii. 335
 Bucer draws up the Tetrapolitan Confession, ii. 421; modifies the eucharistic doctrines, 6, 10; his partial success, 9
 Budneians, iii. 170, 180
 Bugenhagius, ii. 414
 Bulgaranus, i. 455
 Bulgaria converted, i. 522; annexed to the see of Constantinople, 569; Paulicians in, ii. 8; iii. 571.
 Bullinger, iii. 354
 Buonaparte, Napoleon, re-establishes religion in France, iii. 535; celebrates this restoration, 537; crowned, 540; denies privy to the pope's arrest, 543
 Burchard of Worms, i. 603
 Burekhard, Francis, ii. 560
 Burgess, bp., iii. 558
 Burgo, John de, ii. 297
 — von, iii. 239
 Burgundians, conversion of, i. 306, 321
 Burgundy, James of, iii. 42
 Buridan, ii. 258, 259
 Buriensis, Richard, ii. 294
 Burly, Walter, ii. 290
 Burnet, bp., iii. 415
 Burrhi, iii. 291
 Bus, Cæsar de, ii. 520
 Buscher, iii. 323, 325
 Butler, Edmund and Peter, iii. 129
 Butrio, Anthony de, ii. 297
Cythus, i. 54, 148
 Czovius, ii. 522

CABADES, i. 427

Cabasilas, ii. 254
 Cabbala, i. 28, 56
 Cabrieres, ii. 416
 Cæcilian, i. 288
 Cæsarians, ii. 200
 Cæsarius, i. 256
 — of Arles, i. 411, 412, 447
 — of Heisterback, ii. 228
 Cæsenas, ii. 281
 Cainites, i. 150
 Cains, a learned ecclesiastic of Rome, i. 179; opposes a belief in the Millennium, 192
 Cajanists, i. 430

CAJ

- Cajetan, H. 389
 Calderinus, ii. 296
 Calderwood, birth of, iii. 81
 Caleca, ii. 289
 Calistus, II., ii. 130
 Calixtine controversy in cent. XVII., iii. 322
 Calixtus, ii. 354
 Calixtus, George, iii. 242, 312, 317, 321, 323;
 Frederic, 317
 — II., ii. 111
 — III., ii. 114, 330
 Callistus, ii. 289
 Calovius, iii. 319, 324
 Calvin, John, intolerance of, ii. 238; eucharistic
 doctrine of, iii. 7; particulars of, 11; polity of,
 12; opposed upon questions of discipline, 36;
 establishes a professor of philosophy at Geneva,
 37; Scriptural expositions of, *ib.*; thought
 to weaken some of the prophecies relating to
 the Messiah, *ib.*; contests of, with immoral
 Genevans, 39; concerned in the death of
 Servetus, 164, 165
 Camaldulensians, the, ii. 43
 Camariota, ii. 339
 Camaterus, ii. 124
 Cambalu, ii. 252
 Camero, John, iii. 357
 Campanus, iii. 162
 Campegius, ii. 402
 Campion, Edmund, iii. 49
Campita, i. 289
 Canales, ii. 346
 Candidus, i. 123
 — the Arian, i. 264
 — of Isauria, i. 343
 Canisius, Peter, ii. 561
 Canning, George, iii. 547
 Cannobin, ii. 555
 Canon, John, ii. 294
 — of the N. T., i. 64
 — of the mass regulated by Gregory the Great,
 i. 425
 — law, the, ii. 105; new, i. 535
 Canonesses, i. 538
Canonici juris, Corpus, ii. 179
 Canonisation, origin of, i. 551, 552, 606; reserved
 to the pope, 117
 Canons, institution of, i. 494; regular, 538; ii.
 47; secular, *ib.*; white, 122
 — English, compilation of, iii. 393
 Cantacunenus, ii. 254
 Canterbury, list of archbps. of, i. 621; ii. 596;
 iii. 630
 Cantipratensis, ii. 217
 Canus, Melchior, ii. 522
 Canute, John, iii. 348
 Canz, iii. 589
 Capgrave, ii. 346
 Capistranus, John, ii. 340
 Capito, ii. 176, 217
 Capnio, ii. 350, 378
 Cappel, Lewis, iii. 359
 Capreolus, i. 348
 — John, ii. 342
 Captives, redemption of, brethren of, ii. 192

CAT

- Capuchins, origin of, ii. 518
 Caputiati, ii. 158
 Caracalla, the Emperor, toleration of Christians
 under, i. 157
 Caraccioli, ii. 348
 Caranza, ii. 522
 Carasomi, ii. 182
 Carbeas, i. 575
 Cardinals, in early times, ii. 24, 25; invested
 with the right of choosing the pope, 117;
 allowed to hold many benefices, 320; name
 of, 505
 Carinthia converted, i. 519
 Cario, John, ii. 561
 Carit converted, i. 579
 Caritopolus, ii. 214
 Carlisle, bishopric of, founded, ii. 87
 Carmelites, the, ii. 123, 193
 — barefooted, ii. 519
 Carnatic, the, iv. 10
Caroline Books, the, i. 499, 512
 Carolstadt, or Carlstadt, ii. 391; hasty reforms
 of, 399; account of, *ib.*; his opinion of the
 eucharist, 402, 403; invited to Denmark,
 413; precipitancy of, 569; particulars of, *ib.*
 Carolus Fernandus, ii. 349
 Carpathius, John, i. 507
 Carpocrates, i. 147
 Carpv, iii. 589
 Carpv, iii. 319
 Cartesian argument, ii. 18
 — philosophy forbidden, iii. 385
 Carthusians, the, ii. 45; oppose the royal supre-
 macy, 446
 Cartwright, iii. 53
 Casey, bishop, iii. 115
 Cassander, ii. 523
 Cassianus, John, i. 344; endeavours to modify
 the system of Augustine, 384
 Cassiodorus, i. 415, 418
 Castalio, Sebastian, iii. 41
 Castelnau, Peter, ii. 234
 Castlereagh, lord, iii. 523
 Casuistry, study of, ii. 301
 Casuists, iii. 271
 Catabaptism, iii. 143
 Cataphrygians, i. 155
 Catechism. Tridentine, composed, ii. 516
 — Luther's, ii. 516
 — of Cracow, iii. 171.
 — Assembly's, iii. 376
 Catechumens, meaning of the term, i. 73; nature
 of, 60; making of, 220
Catenæ, i. 419, 554
Cathari, the, i. 210; opinions of, ii. 148
 Catharina Bononiensis, ii. 346
 Catharine, St., ii. 11, 268
 — the empress, iii. 490
 Catharinus, Ambrose, ii. 522
 Cathedral schools, i. 484; reform, in England,
 iii. 616
 Catholic emancipation, iv. 459
Catholic, a name among the Armenians, ii. 547,
 548
 Cattenburgh, iii. 428

CAU

- Caussin, Nicholas, iii. 267
 Ceceus Asculanus, ii. 259
 Cecil, W. lord Burghley, one of Elizabeth's first council, ii. 456
 Cedrenus, ii. 15
 Celibacy, clerical, treatment of, at Nice, i. 301; preference for, in cent. III., 171; enforced, ii. 34
 Cellites, ii. 285
 Cellot, Lewis, iii. 267
 Celsus, attack upon Christianity by, i. 106
Centurie Magdeburgenses, i. 2; ii. 521
 Ceolfrid, i. 456
 Cerdo, i. 143
 Ceremonies and rites, history of, i. 609
 Cerinthus, i. 90
 Cerri, Urban, iii. 184
 Certificated, i. 164
 Cerularius, Michael, ii. 58
 Cescomes, Arnaldus, ii. 295
 Ceylon, Dutch missions in, iii. 199
 Chalcedon, council of, i. 374
 Chalcidius, i. 231, 393
 Chaldaic Christians, i. 372
 Chaldeans, ii. 545, 559
 Cham-Hi, iii. 191
Chamsi, ii. 551
 Chancery, apostolic, ii. 263
 Chapters, the three, i. 422
 Chapters, division of the Bible into, alleged date of, ii. 215
 Charenton, decree of, iii. 308
 Charitable conference, iii. 237
 Charlemagne, religious expeditions of, against the Saxons, i. 479; against the Huns, 480; canonized, *ib.*; marches into Spain, 482; acts under Alcuin's advice, 484; orders the formation of cathedral schools, *ib.*; erects the *palatine* school, 485; thought to have founded the university of Paris, *ib.*; gives large landed possessions to the church, 488; overturns the Lombard kingdom, and enlarges the papal dominions, 491; emperor of the west, *ib.*; had the right of appointing the pope, 495; literary remains of, 498; unbounded value of, for the Bible, 504; draws up objections to the worship of images, 512; transmits the deuterio-Nicene decrees to England, *ib.*; assembles the council of Frankfort, 512; forbids some superstitions, 514; favourable to the popes, *ib.*; death, 519.
 Charles the Bald, a patron of learning, i. 527; owed his throne to the pope, 532; his reign favourable to the papacy, 534; desires an inquiry into the eucharistic question, 544, 561
 — Martel, i. 482
 — I., iii. 369, 396, 398
 — II., Romish treachery of, iii. 236
 — IV., the emperor, ii. 283
 — V., elected emperor, ii. 397; gives Luther a hearing at Worms, *ib.*; requires attention to the decree against Luther, 402, 408; petitioned to call a free council, 408; abolishes the papal authority in Spain, and makes war upon the pope, *ib.*; imprisons the envoys of

CHR

- the PROTESTANTS, 409; endeavours to persuade the pope to call a council, 411; his sister Isabella a Lutheran, 413; makes his entry into Augsburg, 418; refuses to have the Tetrapolitan confession publicly read, 422; urges the pope for a general council, 425; orders the conference of Worms, 429; negotiates with the Protestants to gain their approval of a council at Trent, *ib.*; agrees to make war upon those Germans who would not admit it, 430; takes the field against the Protestants, 430, 431; obtains from the diet an assent to the council of Trent, *ib.*; has the *interim* prepared, 431; obtains papal consent for re-opening the council of Trent, 432; hopes to set limits there to the papal power, 433; foiled by the elector Maurice, 434; infuses Protestantism into Spain, by means of divines taken into Germany to confute it, 440
 Charles IX., accession of, iii. 16; death of, 17
 — X., iii. 577
 Charron, Peter, ii. 500
 Chatel, abbé, iii. 578
 Chatham, earl of, speech of, upon the church, iii. 515
 Chaumont, iii. 190
 Chemists, iii. 216
 Chemnitz, Martin, ii. 521, 562
 Cherigato, ii. 401
 Chiaromonti, iii. 535
 Chiersey, synod of, i. 565
 Childeric, i. 489
 Chiliasts, the, i. 192
 Chillingworth, iii. 379
 China, partial conversion of, i. 433; Christianity planted in, ii. 498; its religious condition, iii. 187, 189–193, 194; papal rebuke to the Jesuits in, 472
Chorepiscopi, i. 63, 239
Choreute, i. 316
 Chosroes, i. 395
 Chrim, peculiar privilege of the oriental patriarchs as to, ii. 548
 Christ, difficulties as to the year of the birth of, i. 30; history of, 30
 Christ church, Dublin, imposition at, iii. 116
 Christian era, adoption of, i. 31, 412
 — II., ii. 412; III., 414
 —, William, iii. 244
 Christianity, causes of the rapid propagation of, i. 40; why hated by the Romans, 44; made a crime only by Nero and Domitian, 43, 71
 Christians of St. Thomas, ii. 510
 Christina, queen, iii. 232, 244
 Christmas, observances in the time of celebrating, i. 31, 285
 Chrodegand, i. 501
 Chrodegang, i. 494, 501
 Chromatius of Aquileia, i. 347
Chronicon Alexandrinum, i. 452
 Chrysoloras, ii. 338
 Chrysostom extends the jurisdiction of the see of Constantinople, i. 244; account of, 249; banishment and death of, 359

CHR

- Chrzescians, of Poland, iii. 174
 Chunar, i. 12
 Church-papists, iii. 120
 Churches, primitive constitution of, i. 52
 Church government, various views of the primitive, i. 59
 Chytraus, David, ii. 561
 Cinnamus, John, ii. 101
Circumcelliones, the, i. 290, 292, 362
 Cistercians, ii. 44; exempted from tithes, 120
 Civil law, the, ii. 105
 Claim of Right, iii. 417
 Clairvaux, ii. 126
 Clarendon, constitutions of, ii. 114, 116
 Clarke, Dr. Samuel, iii. 485
 Classes, Dutch, iii. 385
 Claude, John, disputes with Bossuet, iii. 238; denies the oriental belief in transubstantiation, 297
 Claudius, i. 164
 — of Turin, i. 542; opinions of, 554, 559
 Claudius, the Savoyard, iii. 162
 — Mammertus, i. 349
 Clemangis, ii. 339
 Clemens Romanus, i. 66
 — Alexandrinus, i. 109, 120, 125, 127
 Clement II., ii. 22
 — III., ii. 39–41, 118, 134 orders unleavened bread and water with the wine at the eucharist, 146
 — IV., ii. 188, 222
 — V., ii. 255, 263
 — VI., ii. 267
 — VII., elected, ii. 268, 401; forms an alliance with France, 408; with Charles V., 411; evades applications for a council, 425; dies, *ib.*
 — VIII., iii. 225, 274, 293
 — IX., iii. 227, 251, 281; peace of, 281
 — XI., iii. 228
 — XIV., iii. 489
 — the Scot, i. 515
 — St., bishop of Rome, i. 67; apocryphal works under his name, i. 67
Clementina, i. 190
 Clermont, council of, ii. 6, 41
 Climacus, John, i. 411
 Clovis, conversion of, i. 322
 Clugni, or Cluny, ii. 43
 Cluniac order, the, *ib.*
 Cluniacs, origin of, i. 601
 — supposed efficacy of their prayers, i. 610
 Cocceians, iii. 384
 Cocceius, John, iii. 351, 385, 386
 Cochin China, Romanism in, iii. 189
 Cochlæus, ii. 522
 Codde, iii. 282
 Codinus, ii. 337
 Coelestine, eremites of St. Francis, ii. 205
 — pope, i. 323, 347, 366
 — II., ii. 112, 132
 — III., ii. 118, 134
 — IV., ii. 187
 — V., ii. 189
 Coelestius, i. 379

CON

- Cæna Domini*, bull *In*, ii. 516
 Cœnobites, i. 294
 Cogitosus, i. 416
 Colchester, lord, iii. 548
 Cole, Dr., ii. 436, 461; iii. 115
 Colenso, bp., on the *Pentateuch and Book of Joshua*, iii. 622
 Coligni, admiral, projects a protestant colony in America, ii. 499; murdered, iii. 17
 Collatius, ii. 350
 Collects, monastic, ii. 508
 Colleges of piety, iii. 329, 330
 Collegians, iii. 465
 Collyridians, i. 318
 Colman, i. 439
 Colonia Dominic, ii. 534
 Colonial episcopacy, English, iii. 556
 Columbanus, i. 403, 414, 435
 Columbario, Peter de, ii. 295
 Columbas, i. 391; ii. 312
 Comacchio, i. 490
 Combe, de la, iii. 289
 Combefis, iii. 267
 Commendone, ii. 451
 Commodianus, i. 181
 Common life, brethren and clerks of, ii. 335
 Common Prayer, last review of, iii. 405
 Communion in both kinds allowed by Pius IV., ii. 516; frequent Romish controversy upon, 533
 Community of goods, primitive, i. 37
 Commena, Anna, ii. 102
 Comprehension, a, meditated at the Restoration, iii. 403; afterwards under Charles II., 419; attempted under William III., 415; plan of revived in 1772, 516
 Compton, bp., iii. 411, 417
Conception, festival of, i. 426, 147
 Concessions, Romish, offered to the protestants in cent. XVII., iii. 240
 Conclave, ii. 504
Concord, *Formula of*, iii. 344
Concordance, introduction of the, ii. 225
Concordat, ii. 331, 376; iii. 536, 545
 Concubinage, i. 600; ii. 31
 Condé, prince of, iii. 17, 18
 Conferences between protestants and Romanists, iii. 237
 Confession, auricular, origin of, i. 361; decreed synodically, ii. 224
 — Augsburg, ii. 419
 — Tetrapolitan, ii. 420
 — Zuinglian, *ib.*
 — Cracow, iii. 171
Confession of Faith, ii. 483
Confessional, the, iii. 511
 Confessor, meaning of the term, i. 45
 Confirmation, primitive, i. 81
 Conformity, Romish, in Elizabeth's first years, iii. 44
 Confucius, iii. 187, 195
 Congal, i. 402
 Congo, conversion of, ii. 313
 Congregation, the lords of, ii. 468
 Congregationalists, iii. 370

CON

Congregations, papal, ii. 505
 Cononites, i. 431
 Conrad of Lichtenau, ii. 175, 176
 — Marpurg, ii. 220, 233, 237
 Consalvi, card., iii. 574
 Conscientiaries, iii. 210
 Consistories, Lutheran, ii. 558
Consolati, ii. 150
 Constance, council of, ii. 321; approved by the convention of Paris, in 1682, iii. 254
 Constans, i. 304
 Constantia, i. 302
 Constantine obtains the empire, i. 217; tolerates the Christians, *ib.*; said to have been converted by means of a cross seen in the heavens, 218; date of his adherence to Christianity, 219; was cruel and voluptuous, 220; remained unbaptized till the end of life, *ib.*; the cross said to have been seen by him, 221; patronizes the clergy liberally, 224; death, *ib.*; external administration of the church undertaken by, 242; works of, 255; severe towards the Donatists, 290; repeals the laws against them, 291; letter of, upon Arianism, 296; pretended grant of, 492
 — Pogonatus, i. 449
 — Copronymus, i. 493, 510
 — Porphyrogenitus, i. 588
 — Harmenopolis, i. 124
 — pope, i. 501, 507
 Constantinople, bishop of, second rank given to, i. 244; council of, 312; increased authority of the see of, 331; council of, excommunicates Eutyches, 374; council of, the fifth general, 423; the sixth general, 467; against images, 510; that called by the Greeks the eighth general, 558; that called by the Latins the eighth general, 568; that in cent. XI., ii. 60; occupied by the Latins, 163; taken by the Turks, 313; council of, in cent. XVI., 544; patriarchs of, in cent. XIX., iii. 569
 Constantius, i. 215, 304
 — prime minister in Siam, iii. 190, 191
 — Manasses, ii. 102
 Constructive recusancy, iii. 517
 Consubstantiation in cent. XIII., ii. 230
 — ii. 402; iii. 13
 Contra-Remonstrants, iii. 420
 Convention Parliament, iii. 413
 Conventual brethren, iii. 284
 Convocation, last years and discontinuance of, iii. 500
 Convulsionists, ii. 309
 Conway, Roger of, ii. 295
 Coornpart, iii. 354
Copiate, i. 170
 Copronymus, Constantine, i. 493, 510, 611
 Coptic church, the, ii. 545
 Copts, intercourse of, with Rome, ii. 509
 Coracion, i. 192
 Corbinian, i. 478
 Cordesius, ii. 199
 Cordt, Christ. Barth. de, iii. 468
 Cornelius, bishop of Rome, i. 180, 203
 — a Lapide, iii. 268

CUR

Cörner, iii. 345
 Cornwallis, abp., iii. 516
 Corporation act, iii. 408
Corpus Christi, festival of, ii. 188, 231
 Corrupticlae, i. 430
 Cortesius, ii. 357
 Cosin, bp., iii. 405
 Cosmas of Jerusalem, i. 96.
 — Indicopleustes, i. 399; opinion of, as to the Psalms, i. 353
 Cosmo de Medicis, ii. 317
 Cotelier, iii. 269
 Councils, origin of, i. 64, 116; convoked by princes, 401; list of principal, i. 617; ii. 594; iii. 629
 Countries of obedience, ii. 508
 Covenant, the first, ii. 469, 473; the second, 478; the third, 479; last, 480; adopted in Scotland, iii. 400; imposed upon England, 401
 Cowper, the poet, causes a selection of Mad. Guyon's poems to be translated into English, iii. 289
 Cracovius, George, ii. 582
 Cracow, Socinian catechism and confession of, iii. 171
 Cranmer, abp., birth, ii. 441; in great influence under Edward VI., 448; consents to alterations in the liturgy, 449; admits civil encroachments upon the episcopate, 450; pleads guilty of high treason, 453; his last troubles, 453, 454
 Crautwald, ii. 570
 Creed, Apostles', i. 457
 Creeds, early use of, i. 71
 Crell, iii. 464, 485
 — Nicholas, ii. 588
 — Samuel, adoption of an ancient party-name by, i. 152
 Crequi, marquess, iii. 253
 Crescens, i. 107
 Cresconius, i. 454
 Croats, conversion of, i. 434, 435
 Cromer, abp., iii. 112
 Cromwell, Oliver, iii. 236, 371, 372
 Crosby, iii. 157
 Crosier, origin of, i. 283
 Cross, sign of, used in the third century, i. 197
 — said to have been seen by Constantine, i. 227; of Christ, said to have been found by Helena, 267
 — worship of, established at Nice, i. 511
 Crown of St. Mary, i. 610
 Crusade, first, i. 585; second, ii. 95; third, 96
 Crusaders, privileges of, ii. 10
 Crusades, the, begun, ii. 6
 Crypto-Calvinists, ii. 533
 Cudworth, Ralph, iii. 379
 Cuiper, iii. 466
 Cummenens Albus, i. 455
 Cummianus, i. 455
 Cup, the, conceded, ii. 356
 — sacramental, denied to the laity at Constance, ii. 325
 Cupar, outrage in, ii. 477
 Curcellæus, iii. 428

Curopalates, ii. 337
 Curwen, abp., iii. 116, 117, 120
 Cusanus, ii. 340
 Cuthbert, biographer of Bede, i. 501
 Cydonius, ii. 289
 Cyprian raises objections to the *libelli pacis*, i. 163; martyred, *ib.*; wrote against the Jews, *ib.*; acted episcopally with the advice of his presbyters, 168; concedes a qualified primacy to the see of Rome, *ib.*; the earliest assessor of extensive episcopal rights, 169; account of him, 177, 209; his works, 188
 Cyprianus, pupil of Cæsarius of Arles, i. 416
 Cyprus, George of, ii. 214
 Cyran, St., iii. 259, 277, 283
 Cyriacus, ii. 317
 Cyril of Alexandria, i. 337, 352, 367
 — of Berrhæa, iii. 297
 — the missionary to Bohemia, i. 521, 522
 — of Jerusalem, i. 249, 269
 — a monk of Palestine, i. 411
 — patriarch of Constantinople, iii. 569
 Cyrillus Lucaris, iii. 295
 Cyrus of Alexandria, i. 464
 — of Phasis, i. 452

D'ACHERY, iii. 265
 D'Ailly, or de Alliaco, Peter, ii. 290
 Dalmatia converted, i. 522
 Damascenus, John, i. 497, 506, 507
 Damascius, i. 394
 Damasus, i. 243, 263
 — II. i. 23
 Damianists, i. 431
 Damianus, Crassus, ii. 351
 Dancers, sect of, ii. 309
 Danhauer, iii. 318, 319, 342
 Daniel, Gabriel, iii. 271
 — of Winchester, i. 477
 Danish mission to India, iii. 473
 Dante, ii. 250
 Dantzie, iii. 25
 Dantzigers, iii. 457
 Darenis, John, i. 507
 Darjes, iii. 589
 Dataria, ii. 507
 David de Augusta, ii. 221
 Davides, Francis, iii. 181
 Deaconesses, i. 62
 Deacons, order of, i. 36, 61
 Dead languages, liturgical use of, ii. 68
 Decalogue truncated, ii. 80
 Decius, persecution under, i. 163
 Declinature, iii. 88
 Decretals, the, i. 265, 535; studied extensively in cent. XIII., ii. 179; an account of them, *ib.*
 De Gray, John, ii. 185
 Degrees, academical, instituted, ii. 174
 De Haem, iii. 486
 De la Rue, iii. 265
 Delitiosi, ii. 277
 Delli Consi, ii. 277
 Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, attacks Origen, i. 193

Demiurge, i. 55, 148
 Demons, opinion of Ammonius upon, i. 111
 Denison case, iii. 614
 Denk, iii. 140
 Denmark finally converted, ii. 583; reformation in, ii. 413; church in, iii. 598
 Deoduin, ii. 52
 Deposing bull against Queen Elizabeth, iii. 45; alleged mitigation of, 50; power, disclaimed by the convention of Paris in 1682, iii. 254
 Des Cartes, iii. 213, 218
 Desiderius, i. 397, 453, 491
 Desmond, earl of, iii. 125, 129, 131
 Deurhof, iii. 484
 Devay, Matthias, iii. 98
 Devey, *ib.*
 Devil, Becker upon the, iii. 388, 390
 Dezius, iii. 240
 Diadochus of Photice, i. 343
 Dialectics, definition of, ii. 17
 Dictates of Gregory VII., ii. 28, 29
 Didymus of Alexandria, i. 254
 Digest, the, ii. 104
 Dinant, David, ii. 245
 Dinkelspulus, ii. 345
 Dioceses, episcopal, original formation of, i. 63; ecclesiastico-civil, under the Roman empire, enumeration of, 239
 Diocletian, first tolerant of Christianity, i. 213; issues an edict against it, 214; becomes a violent persecutor, 215
 Diodorus of Tarsus, i. 252
 Dion Cassius, i. 166
 Dionysian era, i. 412
 Dionysius Exiguus, i. 412; introducer of the Christian era into chronology, i. 30;
 — bishop of Corinth, i. 123
 — the *pseudo*-Areopagite, i. 555; supposititious works under his name, 190, 272
 — the missionary, i. 160; of Alexandria, 176, 192, 205
 — the pope, i. 181
 — the mystic, i. 269, 272
 — Periegetes, ii. 101
 — a Ryckel, ii. 342
 Diospolis, council of, i. 382
 Dippel, iii. 338
 Disciples, the seventy, i. 58
Disciplina Arcani, i. 74
 Disciplinary controversy, the, iii. 52
 Discipline, Lutheran, ii. 559; Calvin's, iii. 36; first book of (Scottish), ii. 485; second book of, iii. 74, 78, 80, 81, 92, 98
 Disney, Dr., iii. 512
 Dispensing power, iii. 412
 Disputation at Westminster, ii. 461
 Dissenters hostility of, to James II., iii. 412; in present century, 617.
 Dissidents, Polish, iii. 234, 532
 Doctrinal Puritanism, iii. 55
 Doddridge, Dr., desirous of a comprehension, iii. 516
 Dodwell, Henry, iii. 382
 Dogmatici, ii. 139
 Dogmatics, Romish, ii. 328

DOL

Dolet, Stephen, ii. 499
 Dominic, founder of the Dominicans, ii. 194
 Dominicans, ii. 193
 Domitian, persecution of, i. 43; Magian system, great distinction of, *ib.*
 Domitius, his collection of laws enacted against the Christians, i. 43
 Donatists, the, i. 289, 292, 362; extinguished, 427
 Donatus, i. 289; works of, 263; of Metz, 502
 Donellan, abp., iii. 119
 Door-keepers, i. 170
 Dorbellus, ii. 346
 Dorotheus, i. 255, 349, 451, 458
 Dort, synod of, iii. 355, 363, 395, 425
 Dositheus, i. 86; iii. 297
 Douglas, abp. iii. 69
 Dowdall, abp., iii. 113, 115, 120
 Dracontius, i. 347
 Drepanius Florus, i. 543
 Dreyer, iii. 328
 Druids, power of, i. 486, 488
 Druses, i. 158; ii. 551
 Druthmar, i. 543, 544, 554
 Ducas, ii. 339
Ducenarius, i. 206
 Dudith, iii. 170
 Dulcinus, ii. 246
 Dundee, episcopacy abolished at, iii. 82
 Dungal, i. 529, 547, 559
 Dungannon, iii. 523
 Dünkelspühl, ii. 333
 Duns Scotus, ii. 289
 Dunstan, i. 603; ii. 81, 82
 Duraeus, John (Dury), iii. 310
 Durand, ii. 52
 — of St. Porçain, ii. 290
 — William, ii. 217, 218
 Durant, William, ii. 293
 Durham university, iii. 559
 Durlach, conference of, iii. 237
 Dury, iii. 74, 83, 85, 87, 90
 Dynamius, i. 417

EADMER, ii. 130

Eanfleda, i. 439
 Earnulph of Rochester, ii. 130
 East Anglia, conversion of, i. 440
 —, worship towards the, i. 134
 — India Company's charter, iii. 557
 Easter, different times of celebrating, i. 78, 135; the time settled synodically, 300; Romish, continued opposition to, in Britain, 460; laughter, ii. 380
 Eastern churches, iii. 565
 Ebarardus of Ratisbon, ii. 293
 Ebbo, i. 520, 547
 Ebed Jesu, i. 580
 Ebionites, i. 92, 140; ii. 66
 Ecbert of St. Florin, ii. 133
 Eccard, or Aycard, Henry, ii. 307
Ecclesiæ Tripolitaneæ, ii. 584
 Ecclesiastical history, writers of, i. 5; reserva-

ENG

tion, ii. 559; property confiscated in France, iii. 494; commission, 412
 Echniazin, ii. 547
 Eckius, ii. 389, 391, 392, 522
 Eclectics, origin and principles of, i. 20, 109; modern, iii. 224
 Economics in theology, i. 188
Ecthesis, i. 466
 Eddius, Stephen, i. 501
 Edelmann, iii. 591.
 Edessa, school of, i. 371; James of, 447
 Edgar, ii. 81
 Edinburgh entered by the congregation, ii. 478; evacuated, 479; tumult in, iii. 99
 Edmonds, Elizabeth, iii. 115
 Edward VI., ii. 448, 452
 Edwards, Thomas, ii. 503
 Eginhard, i. 500, 542
 Eichstadt, Philip of, ii. 293
 Eitzen, Paul von, ii. 585
 Elcesaites, i. 142
 Elders, primitive, i. 60
 Elderships, iii. 18
 Elect, Manichæan, i. 203
 Elector Palatine elected king of Bohemia, iii. 230
 Eleutherus, pope, connexion of, with king Lucius, i. 96
 Elevation of the eucharist, rise of, i. 287; first greeted with prostration, ii. 146
 Elfreda, ii. 79
 Elfric, ii. 84
 Elias, a general name of one class of the Nestorian patriarchs, ii. 549
 — of Crete, i. 501
 — of Siggara, i. 515
 Eligius, i. 447, 453, 456, 457
 Eliot, John, iii. 204
 Elipandus, i. 517
 Elizabeth, Queen, accession, ii. 455; receives an overture of marriage from Philip II., 456; notifies her accession to the pope, 456; crowned, 457; declines papal overtures, 462; assists the Scottish congregation, 479; views of her religious policy by Mosheim, and Dissenters, iii. 20; her explanation of the supremacy, 34; the bull to dethrone her, 45, 49; displeased with the Lambeth articles, 55, 56; her religious firmness, 59
 — of Schönhangen, ii. 133, 136
 Elmacin, ii. 172, 173
 Elxai, i. 141
 Ely, bishopric, founded, ii. 87
 Emanations, i. 55
 Emanuel Palæologus, ii. 289
 Emigration, Protestant, from Ireland, iii. 549
 Eminence, title of, conferred on cardinals, iii. 226
 ·Empaytaz, iii. 600
 Emsa, Stephen de, ii. 154
 Emser, ii. 522
 Enkratites, i. 145
 End, the, a justification of means, iii. 271
Engagement, the, iii. 377
 Engelbert, ii. 222

ENG

- England, Protestant movements in, ii. 418
 — the new Romanist hierarchy in, iii. 576
 — church of, in cent. XIX., iii. 602
 Ennodius, i. 400, 402, 412
Enthusiasts, i. 316
 Eon of Bretagne, ii. 159
 Ephesus, council of, i. 367, 374, 382
 Ephræm Syrus, i. 252, 271
 Ephraim of Antioch, i. 410
 Epictetus, i. 109
 Epicureans, principles of, i. 18; popularity of, 109
 Epiphanes, i. 147
 Epiphanius of Constantinople, i. 410
 — of Salamis, i. 250
 — Scholasticus, i. 415
 Epiphany, oriental, i. 285
 Episcopacy, English, abolition of, iii. 374;
 Scottish overthrow of, 524; toleration of, 527; views of the Roman court upon, ii. 518
 Episcopius, iii. 425, 428
 — Simon, iii. 429
 Era, Christian, first brought into chronological use, i. 31
 Eremite brethren of St. William, ii. 191
 Eremites, i. 275; ii. 193
 Eric, St., ii. 90
 Erigena, i. 529, 537, 555, 556, 559, 561, 562
 Ernest of Hesse, iii. 245
 — Justinian, iii. 199
 Erantry, knight, origin of, ii. 42
Erteng, i. 202
 Esaianists, i. 313
 Easias of Cyprus, ii. 338
 Espencœus, ii. 522
 Essays and Reviews, iii. 622
 Essenes, principles of scriptural interpretation held by, i. 25; habits of, 26; meaning of their name, i. 28
 Essex, conversion of, i. 440
 Estius, iii. 268
 Ethelbert, king of Kent, ii. 148
 Ethelburga, i. 439
 Ethel erd, i. 591
 Ethelwold, ii. 82
 Etherius, i. 502
 Eucharist, primitive administration of, i. 79; usages respecting, in cent. I., 136; in cent. III., 195; superstitious veneration for, i. 513
 Eucharistic controversy in Scotland, iii. 623
 Eucherius of Lyons, i. 344, 355
 Euchites, i. 316; ii. 147
 Eudocia, i. 341
 Eudoxius of Germanica, i. 256
 Eugene III., ii. 132
 — IV., ii. 327
 Eugenius II., pope, i. 548
 — III., ii. 112
 — of Toledo, i. 455
 Euyppius the African, i. 413; of Naples, 415
 Eulogius of Antioch, i. 407; the martyr, 524; of Corduba, 548
 Eunapius, i. 230, 237
 Eunoimians, i. 307
 Eunoimius of Uzcium, i. 256

FAT

- Euphemites, i. 316
 Euphemius, i. 524
 Eusebians, i. 306
 Eusebius, Pamphili, i. 245; of Nicomedia, 255, 296, 302; of Emesa, 255; Vercellensis, 264; of Dorylæum, 343, 374; of Thessalonica, 452
 Eustathians, i. 277
 Eustathius, i. 278, 343, 348
 Eustratius, i. 411; ii. 103, 123
 Euthalius, i. 343
 Euthérius, i. 342
 Euthimius Zigabenus, ii. 123
 Eutropius, i. 417
 Eutyches, i. 343, 373
 — and Eutychnianism, i. 374
 Eutychnius, i. 411, 589, 602
 Evagrius, i. 354
 — Scholasticus, account and history of, i. 407
 — archdeacon of Constantinople, i. 256
 Evangelical party in England, iii. 604
Evangelists, missionary, i. 58
Everlasting Gospel, the, ii. 201, 202; introduction to it, 202
 Evisa, Stephen de, ii. 154
 Evodius of Uzala, i. 347
Exaltatio crucis, i. 460
 Exarch, Archelaus, the, i. 22; Russian, iii. 300
 Exarchs, i. 239
 Excommunication, early use of, i. 75, 131; papal, 488
 Exemptions, monastic, i. 450; ii. 42; clerical, 496
Exivi de Paradiso, ii. 276
 Exorcism, *formula* of, iii. 349; baptismal, introduction of, i. 195
 Exorcists, i. 170
 Expectative, ii. 264
Exposition, Bossuet's, iii. 239
 Expositors, Scriptural, the first of, i. 125
Expropriation, ii. 204, 279
Extravagantes, ii. 179
 Exucontians, i. 307
 Eymericus, Nicolaus, ii. 215

FABER, bishop, said to have drawn up a confutation of the confession of Augsburg, ii. 420; John, 522
Faculties, the four, ii. 104
 Facundus of Hermiane, i. 412
 Faith and charity, knights of, ii. 192
 Faithful, the, definition of, i. 60, 73
 Falkland, arrangement at, iii. 104
 Farnovians, iii. 170, 182
 Farnovius, death of, iii. 182
 Farrel, William, ii. 416; iii. 12
Faster, John the, i. 399, 407
 Fastidius, i. 347, 355
 Fasting, increased veneration for, in cent. III., i. 196
 Fasts, primitive, i. 81, 286; great, 514
 Fate, Pagan notion of, i. 12; stoical views of, 19
 Fathers, estimate of, i. 525; definition of the term, 506; authority of the, in England, iii. 30

FAU

- Faustinus, i. 265
 Faustus, i. 454; the Manichæan opinion of, as to both Judaism and Christianity, i. 12; book of, 265; of Lerins, 349
 Feast-days, papal diminution of, iii. 293
 Fecknam approves of the oath of supremacy, iii. 34
 Feet-washers, iii. 154
 Felicitas, martyrdom of, i. 161
 Felix of Aptungis, i. 289, 292
 — III., i. 378
 — IV., i. 415
 — V., ii. 329, 330
 — an English monk, i. 501
 Felton, outrage of, iii. 45
 Fenelon, iii. 269; takes part with Mad. Guyon, 290; is condemned by the pope, *ib.*
 Ferdinand, St., ii. 167
 — the catholic, ii. 311
 — the emperor, elected king of the Romans, ii. 424; demands the allowance of whole communion and clerical marriage, 526
 — III., iii. 227
 — VII., iii. 584
 Fernandes Gonsalvo, iii. 189
 Ferrandus, i. 412
 Ferrar, bishop, particulars and martyrdom of, ii. 455
 Ferrara, council of, ii. 328
 Ferrarius, Bartholomew, ii. 520
 Festivals, primitive, i. 78, 137, 285; observed in cent. IV., 285; and fasts in cent. IX., ii. 572; regulated by Charlemagne, 314; Lutheran, 558
 Feuardenius (Feuardent), iii. 267
 Fichte, iii. 590
 Fidatus, ii. 295
 Filesac, iii. 269
 Finan, i. 439
 Fine and Gross, iii. 148
 Finland converted, ii. 90
 Finus Hadrianus, ii. 351
 Fire philosophers, ii. 502, 563; iii. 216
 Firmilian, i. 180
 First-fruits, i. 117, 133; ii. 263
 Fisher, bishop, ii. 446
 — Samuel, iii. 437
 Fitzmaurice, James, iii. 128
 Fitz-Ralph, R., archbishop of Armagh, ii. 270
 Fitzwilliam, earl, iii. 523
 Five Points, the, iii. 422, 429
 Flacius Matthias, ii. 521, 562; made professor of divinity, 577; his controversies, *ib.*; that with the Swiss on the eucharist, iii. 8
 Flagellants, ii. 224; revival of, 308; the new, 364
 Flandrians, iii. 137, 149
 Flavianus, i. 343, 374; of Antioch, 250; of Constantinople, 343
 Fleming, Robert, ii. 348
 Flemings, iii. 137, 149
 Flodoard, i. 591
 Florence of Worcester, ii. 130
 Florinians, i. 150
 Florus, i. 502

FRO

- Florus, the poet, i. 410
Fluctibus, Robert a, ii. 563
 Fludd, Robert, ii. 563; iii. 217, 218
Fœderati, ii. 150
 Fœlix, pope, i. 349
 Folmar, ii. 133
 Fontevraud, order of, ii. 121
 Forbes, William, iii. 241
 Formalists, ii. 107
 Formosa, Dutch missions in, iii. 199, 200
 Formosus, pope, i. 550
Formula Consensus, iii. 391; Scottish, 524
 Fortunatianus, i. 263
 Fortunatus, i. 413
 Fox, Edward, envoy to the league of Smalcald, ii. 423
 — George, iii. 433, 438
 — C. J. admits that no promise was made to the Romanists, iii. 546
 Foxe's Martyrology provided in every parish, ii. 455
 France, ancient division of, ii. 241; reformation in, 415; protestant polity of, iii. 35; revolution of 1789, 563; church in, in cent. XIX, 577
 Franchise, elective, conceded to Irish Romanists, iii. 548, 549
 Francis II., accession of, iii. 16
 — St., ii. 195, 196, 201; conduct of, in the East, 164; works of, 215
 Franciscans, ii. 195; absurd promises of salvation by, 333
 Franck, iii. 331, 334
 Francken, Chr., iii. 181
 Franco, ii. 130
 Francowitz, i. 5
 Frankfort, council of, i. 512
Fraterculi, ii. 195; *de paupere vita*, 206
Fratres de Sacco, ii. 208; *de Pœnitentia*, *ib.*
Fratricelli, ii. 206
 Frauds, pious origin of, i. 275
 Freculphus, i. 543
 Fredegarius, i. 454, 501
 Frederic II., ii. 164, 169, 186; causes translations of Aristotle to be made, 177
 — the Wise, death and services of, ii. 406
 — king of Denmark, ii. 413
 — V. elected king of Bohemia, iii. 230; his reverses, *ib.*
 — Augustus of Poland, iii. 245
 Frederickstadt, iii. 428
 Free Spirit, brethren and sisters of, ii. 241, 306
 French churches, foundation of some early, i. 160
 — protestants, Calvinists, iii. 15; persecuted, 15; numbers of, 18; missions, 185
 Friars preachers, ii. 195
 Fribourg, John of, ii. 292
 Fridegod, i. 604
 Friesland, conversion of, i. 474
 Frieslanders, iii. 459
 Fritigern, i. 233
 Froment, iii. 11
 Fromm, iii. 246
 Fronto, attack upon Christianity by, i. 106

FRO

Frotharius, i. 547
 Fructuosus, i. 455
 Frumentius, i. 232
 Fulbert of Chartres, ii. 49
 Fulcherius Carnotensis, ii. 131
 Fulcuin, i. 592
 Fulda, school of, founded, i. 485
 Fulgentius, i. 412
 Fundamental truths, Origen's enumeration of, i. 183
 Fursey, i. 440

GABRIEL, patriarch of Alexandria, ii. 509
 Gaddana, i. 273
 Gagnæus, John, ii. 527
 Gajanus, i. 430
 Galatinus, ii. 352
 Gale, Theophilus, iii. 379
 Galenists, iii. 459
 Galenus, Abrahams de Haan, iii. 479
 Galerius Maximian, i. 213
 Galileo, iii. 213
 Gall, St., i. 435, 436
 Gallican church, since the Restoration, iii. 577
 Gallican liberties, iii. 251, 254
 Gallienus, i. 164; favour to the Christians shown by, 159
 Gallius, Peter, ii. 412
 Gallon, Anthony, iii. 268
 Gallus, ii. 296
 — persecution under, i. 163
 Galterius, ii. 130
 Ganganeli, iii. 489
 Gangra, council of, i. 278
Gangræna, iii. 376
 Gardiner, Stephen, writes against the papacy, ii. 444; swears against it, 446; deprived, 451
 Garnet, Henry, iii. 235
 Garnier, iii. 264, 265
 Gassendi, iii. 213, 218, 220, 221
 Gaudentius, i. 265
 Gauferius, ii. 52
 Gaufredi, ii. 205
 Gausfrid of Linoges, ii. 134
 Gaul, Belgic, conversion of, i. 95
 — Transalpine, i. 96
 Gaulonites, i. 24
 Gaunilo, ii. 19
 Gazari, i. 522; ii. 70
 Gebevin, i. 612
 Gebhard, ii. 559, 560
 Gebwin, bp, i. 612
 Geiler, ii. 350
 Gelasius, pope, i. 349, 355
 — of Cyzicus, i. 340
 — II., ii. 111, 130
 Gemisthius Pletho, ii. 317, 336, 337
 Genealogy, Christ's, ancient theory of, i. 175
 Genevan school, decline of, iii. 353
 Genghisikan, ii. 100, 162; his family driven from China, 252
 Gennadius, i. 349; ii. 336
 Genseric, i. 363

GOD

Gentilis Valentine, iii. 166
 Genuflexion in prayer, original reason for, i. 196
 Geoffrey of Monmouth, ii. 132
 George of Laodicea, i. 256, 307
 — of Alexandria, i. 452
 — the Galatian, *ib.*
 — Syncellus, i. 497
 — Harmatolus, i. 540
 — Chartophylax, i. 542
 — Xiphilinus, ii. 125
 — Acropolita, ii. 169
 — David, iii. 158
 Georgia, conversion of, i. 232
 Georgian church, the, ii. 544
 Georgius of Coreyra, ii. 125
 Gerbert, i. 592, 593
 Gergentius, i. 411
 Gerhard, ii. 202
 — Odonis, ii. 294
 — Magnus, ii. 296
 — of Zutphen, ii. 297
 — John and John Ernest, iii. 317, 322
 Germain, St., national convention of, iii. 16
 German churches, foundation of some early, i. 160
 German-Roman church, iii. 581
 Gerinans, sect of, iii. 149
 Germanus, i. 416, 496, 509
 — II., i. 213
 Germany, early conversion of, i. 95; church in, in cent. XIX., 579, 587, 595
 Gerson, ii. 339
 — a nominalist, ii. 325
 Gertrude, ii. 221
 Gervais of Tilbury, ii. 175
 Gervasius, ii. 219
 Geyer, iii. 318, 319
 Gilbert, Porretanus, ii. 128
 — of Nogent, ii. 129
 — Crispin, *ib.*
 — Folioth, ii. 132, 138
 — the Franciscan, ii. 222
 Gildae, i. 413
 Giles, St., outrage on the festival of, ii. 467
 Gille, ii. 130
 Giuseppe, San, iii. 130
 Glaber, Radulphus, ii. 51
 Glanvilla, Bartholomew de, ii. 296
 Glassius, iii. 317, 319, 320
 Glenlivat, battle of, iii. 99
Glossa Ordinaria, i. 554; ii. 380
 — *Interlinealis*, ii. 126
 Gloucester, duke of, iii. 419
 Glycas, Michael, ii. 101, 102
 Gnostics, principles of, i. 52, 84, 85, 196; origin of the name, 52; different speculations connected with, 53; rise of, 84
 — Asiatic, i. 142
 — Egyptian, i. 145
 — attacked by Plotinus, i. 197
 Goa, inquisition established in, ii. 497
 Gobelinus, Persona, ii. 345
 — John, ii. 347
 Gobet, iii. 495
 Goddess of Reason, iii. 496

GOD

- Godefridus, ii. 221
 Godehard, ii. 51
 Godescalc, i. 502
 Godeschale, i. 563, 567
 Godfred, i. 525
 Godfrey of Bouillon, ii. 8
 — of Viterbo, ii. 133
 — of Vendôme, ii. 126, 127
 Godliness, apostolic use of the term, i. 70
 Gomar, Francis, iii. 421
 Gomar, iii. 354
 Gonesius, Peter, iii. 167
 Good works, Lutheran controversy upon, ii. 576
 Goodacre, abp., iii. 114
 Gorcomius, ii. 342
 Gordian, tranquillity of the Christians under, i. 158
 Gordianus, i. 416
 Gordon, Lord George, iii. 519
 Gorham case, iii. 613
Gospel, iii. 111
 Gospels, when collected, i. 64; apocryphal, 32, 66
 Gothic liturgy, ii. 67
 Goths, conversion of the, i. 160; final, 232; Arianism of, 305
 Gotselin, or Goscelin, ii. 53
 Gozbert, ii. 51
 Granada, capitulation of, ii. 311
 Grandimontans, the, ii. 45
 Gratian, the canonist, ii. 105
 — emperor, i. 305
 — the missionary, i. 160
Gravamina centum, ii. 401
 Grawer, iii. 317, 318
 Grebel, iii. 141
 Greek, first taught in the West, ii. 255
 — church, great divisions of, ii. 539; confession of, 543; in century XIX., iii. 569, 570
 Greeks, agreement with, arranged at Florence, ii. 330
 Greenland converted, i. 584
 Greenwood, iii. 55
 Gregory the Illuminator, i. 232
 — Thaumaturgus, i. 175, 187
 — Nazianzen, i. 250, 251, 270
 — Nyssen, i. 251, 252
 — the Great, accession, i. 390; disapproves compulsory baptism of Jews, 392; prejudiced against pagan authors, 397; offended by the assumption of the bishop of Constantinople, 400; superstitious, 402; history, 408–411; monachism, 406; doctrines, 417; his *morals*, 419; superstitious rites, 424
 — of Tours, i. 413
 — of Pisidia, i. 452
 — de Rimini, ii. 291
 — Palamas, ii. 305
 — II., i. 501; resists iconoclasm, 503
 — III., i. 501
 — IV., i. 548
 — VI., ii. 22
 — VII., ii. 23, 27–40; death, 40
 — VIII., ii. 111, 118, 134
 — IX., ii. 169, 186, 220

HAL

- Gregory X., ii. 189
 — XI., ii. 222
 — XIII., ii. 268, 576; his designs upon Ireland, iii. 127
 — XVI., iii. 575
 — the Abyssinian, iii. 301
 Gretser, iii. 267
 Grevius, ii. 220
 Grey, Earl, iii. 547
 — Lady Jane, ii. 451
 Gribaldus, Matthew, iii. 166
 Grindal, abp., iii. 59
 Groningenists, iii. 457
 Croote, Gerhard, ii. 335
 Grossus, or Grossius, John, ii. 344
 Grosthead, bp. Robert, ii. 217
 Grotius, Hugo, iii. 215; tolerant views of, 242, 314; scriptural views of, 351, 421–425
 Gruet, iii. 41
 Gruyhodius, ii. 349
 Guaguinus, ii. 350
 Gualbert, ii. 44
 Gualdo, ii. 52
 Gualensis, John, ii. 221
 Guelphs and Gibellines, ii. 187
 Gueric, ii. 131
 Guido, cardinal, introduces prostration when the consecrated bread was elevated, ii. 146
 — of St. Germain's, ii. 222; Baifus, *ib.*
 — of Dauphiny, ii. 130
 — Bernard, ii. 294
 — de Perpiniano, *ib.*
 Guiscard, Robert, ii. 5, 24
 — Roger, ii. 5
 Guitmund, ii. 52
 Guizot, M., iii. 601
 Gulielmus, i. 550
 Gundulph, ii. 73
 Gunpowder conspiracy, iii. 235
 Gunther Ligurinus, ii. 174
 Gunzo, ii. 592
 Gustavus Vasa, ii. 412
 — Adolphus, iii. 232
 Guthlac, St., i. 481
 Guttemberg, ii. 315
 Guyon, Madame, iii. 289–290
 Gyraldus Cambrensis, ii. 219

- H**ABERKORN, iii. 237
 Hackspan, iii. 318, 319
 Haco, i. 583
 Hadrian I., i. 491, 495, 502
 — IV., ii. 37, 133
 — V., ii. 189
 — VI. elected, ii. 400; account of him, *ib.*; death, 401
 Hagne, synod of the, iii. 361
 Haimricus, ii. 296
 Haiton, or Aiton, ii. 289
 Hakem, ii. 551
 Hales, Alexander, ii. 177, 217
 — John, iii. 379; letters of, 425
 Halitgarius, i. 547
 Halleian heretics, ii. 234

HAL

Halleluia, trifling ceremonies about, ii. 360
 Hallensian controversy, iii. 322
 Hamel, ii. 535
 Hamilton, abp., ii. 468
 — Patrick, ii. 418
 Hampden, Dr., iii. 620
 Hampole, Richard, ii. 295
 Hampton Court conference, iii. 363
 Hanapus, ii. 222
 Hanover made an electorate, iii. 419
 — church of, in century XIX., iii. 581
 Harald Blaataand, i. 583
 — Klack, i. 519
 Harding, Stephen, ii. 129
 Harduin, iii. 264
 Harpius, ii. 343
 Hartmannus, i. 549
 Hartwich, ii. 92
 Hattem, iii. 390
 Hatto, i. 547
 Haymo of Halberstadt, i. 544, 554
 Heber, bp., iii. 558; testimony of, as to the unity of God believed among the Hindoos, i. 12
 Hebrew thought unlawful to be learnt of Jews, ii. 137; study of, 316
 Heddus, i. 501
 Hegel, iii. 590
 Hegesippus, i. 5, 123
 Heidegger, iii. 391
 Heidelberg Catechism, iii. 14
 Heimbürg, Gregory de, ii. 347
 Helena, the mistress of Simon Magus, i. 89
 — the seeming originator of pilgrimages, i. 267
 Helinandus, ii. 220
 Heliogabalus, toleration of Christians under, i. 158
 Helladius, i. 342
 Hellwig, iii. 246
 Helmold, ii. 133
 Helmont, Jo. Bapt., iii. 217
 Helmstadian, iii. 322
 Hemerobaptists, i. 24
 Hemming, Nicholas, iii. 28
 Hemmingford, Walter, ii. 294
 Henichius, iii. 328
Henoticon, i. 377
 Henricians, ii. 151
 Henry, the emperor, IV., ii. 34, 35; excommunicated, 37, 38
 — V., ii. 109
 — the Lion, ii. 92
 — VII. of England, makes his son protest against the marriage with Catharine of Aragon, ii. 428
 — VIII. unwilling to join the league of Smalcald, ii. 425; revolts from Rome, 428; converts Luther's opinions, 441
 — III. of France, accession, iii. 17; death, 18
 — IV. apostasy, iii. 15; death, 18
 — of Upsal, ii. 90
 — of Huntingdon, ii. 132
 — the Henrician secretary, ii. 159
 — de Segusio, ii. 221
 — of Ghent, ii. 222
 — Suso, *ib.*

HIG

Henry de Urimaria, ii. 295
 — of Cologne, ii. 306
 — duke of Saxony, iii. 347
 Henschen, iii. 268
 Heraclas, i. 176
 Heraclides, i. 341
 Heraclitus, i. 123, 179
 Heraclius, persecution of the Jews by, i. 437; compromise of, with the Monophysites, 464, 466
 Herard, i. 548
 Herbert, lord, iii. 208
 Herembertus, i. 549
 Herentalius, ii. 297
 Heresies, history of, i. 611
 Heresy, nature of, i. 3; first criminal prosecution for, 314; Elizabeth's statute against, ii. 462; iii. 22
 Heretics, nature of, i. 3; baptism of, 192; first crusade against, ii. 117; salvability of, maintained by Jesuits, 531
 Heric, i. 529, 546
 Heriger of Laubes, i. 604
 Hermann, a converted Jew, ii. 130
 — de Lerbeke, ii. 344
 Hermannus Contractus, ii. 51
 Hermas, *Shepherd* of, i. 69
 Hermes, i. 111
 Hermias, Sozomenus, the ecclesiastical historian, i. 342
 Hermit, Peter the, ii. 6
 Hermogenes, i. 153
 Hermolaus Barbarus, ii. 317, 348
 Heronymus, ii. 339
 Herod the Great, pernicious administration of, i. 22
 Herodians, i. 24
 Herrenhutters, the, iii. 479
 Herring, abp., iii. 516
 Heruli, conversion of, i. 389
 Hervæus Natalis, ii. 290
 Herveus, ii. 131
 Heshusius, ii. 586
 Hesse, conversion of, i. 474; secession of, from Lutheranism, iii. 305
 Hesychasts, ii. 304
 Hesychius, i. 181, 451, 458
 Hetto, i. 547
 Hetzer, iii. 140, 162
 Hevelius, iii. 213
Hexapla, Origen's, i. 185; his perversions of Scripture, *ib.*
 Heylin, Peter, iii. 301
 Hieracites, the, i. 203
 Hierarchy, Christian, formed on the Jewish model, i. 116
 — the new Romanist, in England, iii. 576, 613
 Hierax, i. 203
 Hierocles, a controversialist against Christianity, i. 229
 Hieronymus of Dalmatia, i. 256
 Hieronymus a S. Fide, ii. 344
 Hierotheus, i. 582
 Higden, Ranulph, ii. 215
 High church, iii. 382, 383

HIG

- High Commission Court, iii. 22
 — Scottish, iii. 399
 Hilarion, i. 272
 Hilarius of Sardinia, i. 264
 Hilary of Arles, i. 347
 — Poitiers, account of, i. 256, 269
 — Rome, i. 348
 Hildebert, ii. 51, 57
 Hildebrand, ii. 27; *Dictates* of, 28
 — Joachim, iii. 317, 319
 Hildegardis, ii. 33, 126
 Hildenissen, ii. 364
 Hilduin, i. 542
 Himerius, i. 230
 Hinemar, i. 544
 — of Rheims, i. 554, 564, 565
 Hippolytus, i. 175, 187
 — of Thebes, i. 603
 Hirsaugians, the, ii. 44
 Hoadly, bp., iii. 483, 501
 Hobbes, Thomas, iii. 206, 207, 353
 Hoburg, iii. 345
 Hody, Humphrey, iii. 382
 Hoe, iii. 317, 319
 Hofmann, ii. 564; iii. 141
 Holkot, Robert, ii. 295
 Holland, Reformation in, ii. 437; peculiarities
 in the church of, iii. 4; church in, in cent.
 XIX., 601
 Holstein, Luke, iii. 269
 Holstenius, iii. 246
 Holy cross day, festival of, i. 460
Homiliarium, i. 505
 Homilies, first book of, published, ii. 448
 Hone, Cornelius, ii. 402
 Honorius, i. 319; persecutes the Donatists, 362
 — pope, i. 455; unsound in doctrine, 466
 — II., ii. 112, 131
 — III., ii. 186, 220
 — IV., ii. 189
 — of Autun, ii. 127
 Honsemsius, ii. 295
 Hoogerbeets, iii. 421, 424
 Hoogstrat, ii. 389
 Hooker, moderate views of, iii. 56
 Hooper, bp., particulars and martyrdom of, ii.
 455
 Hormisdas, i. 415, 423
 Horne, Andrew, ii. 251
 — bishop of Winchester, ii. 461
 Horneius, iii. 323
 Horsley, bp., iii. 512, 520
 Hosius, bp. of Corduba, said to have consum-
 mated the conversion of Constantine, i. 219;
 account of him, 252
 — of Cracow, ii. 522
 Hospinian, iii. 345
 Houghton, Sir Henry, iii. 515
 Houpeland, ii. 347
 Hours, canonical, in cent. III., i. 196
 Hoveden, John, ii. 134
 Hubald, i. 604, 608
 Huber, Samuel, iii. 588
 Hubmeyer, iii. 141
 Huet, P. D., iii. 224, 269

HMA

- Hugo of Clugni, ii. 52
 — of Tours, ii. 51
 — of Limoges, *ib.*
 — of Die, ii. 53
 — of St. Flavin, ii. 129
 — of St. Victor, ii. 127
 — Etherianus, ii. 133
 — de S. Caro, ii. 218, 219
 — of Fleury, ii. 130
 — Pratensis, ii. 293
 Huguenot, name of, iii. 15
 Huguenots, persecution of, in cent. XVII., iii.
 235
 Huisseaux, iii. 241
 Hulderic of Augsburg, i. 549
 Hülseman, iii. 318, 319, 324
 Humanity of Christ, early maintenance of, i. 152
 Humbert, ii. 49
 — de Romanis, ii. 219
Humiliati, ii. 191
 Humiliation of Christ, controversy upon, iii.
 340
 Hungarian persecution against Protestants, iii.
 234
 Hungary converted, i. 582; Protestants in, ii.
 418; iii. 28
 Hunneric, i. 364
 Hunnias, Ulr., iii. 245
 Hunnius, iii. 317
 Huns, forcible conversion of, i. 480
 Huntly, earl of, iii. 96
 Huss, John, ii. 322, 343
 Hutter, iii. 317
 Hydatius, i. 348
 Hydrentinus, ii. 215
 Hydroparastites, i. 145, 288
 Hypatia, i. 237
 Hypothetical Universalists, iii. 358
 Hyrcania, conversion of, i. 473

IBAS, i. 342, 372, 422

- Iceland, conversion of, i. 584
Iconoclastæ, i. 510
Iconoduli, *ib.*
Iconolatæ, *ib.*
Iconomachi, *ib.*
 Idacius Clarus, i. 265
 Idatius, i. 348
 Idealism, iii. 590
 Ignatius, martyrdom and epistles of, i. 68, 103
 — deacon at Constantinople, i. 540
 — patriarch, *ib.*
 — general name of the monophysite patriarchs,
 ii. 545
 Ildefonsus of Toledo, i. 453, 458
 Illegitimacy, an undecided objection against a
 pope, ii. 425
 Illyricus, i. 5
 Images, worship of, introduced, i. 351; contro-
 versy upon, 507; and pictures not in the
 primitive churches, *ib.*; worship of established,
 559; relative, ii. 60; rejected in England,
 80; subsequently received, 240; finally for-
 bidden, iii. 118

IMM

- Immaculate conception, ii. 145, 302; iii. 286;
 feast of, ii. 360
 Imola, de, ii. 347
 Impanation, iii. 13
Impostors, the three, ii. 169
 Imputation of Adam's sin, iii. 358
 Incense, introduction of, in churches, i. 194
 Incensers, i. 162
 Incorruptibility of Christ's body, i. 430
 Indemnity, act of, iii. 499
 Independency, rise of, iii. 54
 Independents, account of, iii. 367; their first
 church in England, 371
 India, Romanism in, iii. 187
 Indian episcopate, iii. 557
 Indians, ancient use of the term, i. 95
Indices, expurgatory, ii. 511, 515
 Indifferentism, iii. 208
 Indulgences, rise of, i. 459; nature of, and papal
 traffic in, ii. 136; commonly at the disposal
 of the Franciscans, ii. 197; general preach-
 ing of, in cent. XV., ii. 360; conciliar decrees
 against, *ib.*; sale of, 377; nature of, 381
 Infant communion, early use of, i. 137; supposed
 necessity of, 195, 355
 Infralapsarians, iii. 354
 Ingulph of Croyland, ii. 52
 Inghists, ii. 513
 Innocent I., i. 347
 — II., ii. 27, 112, 131
 — III., ii. 125; overthrows the right of free
 ecclesiastical election, 181; subjugates Rome,
 182; his history, 183
 — IV., ii. 187, 221
 — V., ii. 139, 222
 — VI., ii. 267
 — VIII., ii. 332
 — X., iii. 226, 279; issues a bull against the
 peace of Westphalia, 233
 — XI., iii. 227, 253, 255
 — XII., iii. 228
 Inquisition, origin of, ii. 194, 234; nature of
 proceedings in, 236, 237; resisted at Naples,
 439; re-established, iii. 584
 Insabbati, ii. 154
 Inscription, Spanish, relating to the Neronian
 persecution, i. 48
Institution of a Christian Man, ii. 443
 Interdict laid on Rome, ii. 154; the English
 185; Venetian, iii. 249
Interim, the, ii. 429; the Leipsic, 574
 Intolerance, rise of, i. 275
 Investitures, ii. 35, 41, 110
 Invocation of saints, rise of, i. 351; saintly origin
 of, 607; among the Anglo-Saxons, 82
 Iona monks, Romish conformity of, ii. 78
 Ireland, conversion of, i. 323; ancient literary
 eminence of 506; ancient state of, iii. 110;
 re-establishment of episcopacy in, 406;
 church of, income of, 472; church in, in
 cent. XIX., 602, 624
 Irenæus, mission of, to Gaul, i. 97; works of,
 118; history of, 119, 125
 — bishop of Lyons interferences to stay the in-
 temperance of pope Victor, i. 137

JAN

- Irenæus of Tyre, i. 342
 Irene, i. 511
 Irish types introduced, iii. 119; N. T. published,
 and liturgy, *ib.*
 — bishops, conformity of, iii. 120; confiscations,
 521
 Irvingites, iii. 627
 Isaac, a converted Jew, author of a tract on the
 Trinity, i. 342
 — of Nineve, i. 410
 — of Langres, i. 549
 — of Armenia, ii. 125
 Isbraniki, iii. 298
 Isdegerdes, i. 326
 Isichius, i. 451, 457
 Isidore Gazæus, i. 237
 — of Cordova, i. 347
 — of Pelusium, i. 338, 352
 — of Badajos, i. 501
 — of Seville, i. 414, 420
 — Ruthensis, ii. 338
 — Clarius, ii. 527
 Italic version, the, i. 98, 268
 Italy, loss of, by the Greek empire, i. 509;
 church of, in cent. XIX., iii. 586
 Ivo of Chartres, ii. 51

JACOBELLUS de Misa, ii. 326

- Jacobi, iii. 590
 Jacobins, ii. 195
 Jacobite monks, iii. 191
 Jacobites, i. 377
 —, i. 428, 429
 —, ii. 545; iii. 382
Jacobus de Vitriaco, ii. 215
 Jacobus Baradæus, or Zanzalus, i. 428
 Jagello, ii. 250
 Jamblicus, i. 236
 James the Just, said to have been the first bishop
 of Jerusalem, i. 63
 James I assumes the government of Scotland,
 iii. 64; falls into the hands of favourites, 83;
 detained at Ruthven, 84; escapes from the
 conspirators, 87; denounces the Act of An-
 nexation 92; marries, 94; eulogises the
 church of Scotland, 95; weakness of his go-
 vernment, 97; makes qualified concessions to
 presbyterianism, 98; lenient to the Romish
 party, 99; alarmed by a tumult at Edinburgh,
 100; his literary works, 105; receives and
 condemns the Racovian catechism, 179; at-
 tempts a reconciliation between the Lutherans
 and the Reformed, 308
 — II. iii. 236, 410
 — king of Aragon, ii. 167
 — St. the elder, i. 39
 — the younger, i. 30
 — of Nisibis, i. 255
 — of Lausanne, i. 293
 Jauduno, or Genoa, John de, ii. 282
 Jane, Dr., iii. 415
 Jansen, Erasmus, iii. 176
 Jansenist controversy, iii. 277; miracles, 278;
 propositions, 279; condemned, *ib.*

JAN

- Jansenists, controversy about, iii. 476; miracles of, 478
 Jansenius, iii. 176; condemnation of, 226, 279 280
 Japan, Romish missions to, iii. 195, 196; severe persecution in, 197; early success of Christianity there, 198; subsequent ruin of it, 199
 Jasidians, ii. 548, 550
 Java, Dutch missions in, iii. 301
 Javorski, Stephen, iii. 300, 478
 Jena, university of, founded, ii. 577
 Jerome, account of, i. 258; scriptural version of, 268; attacks Vigilantius, 358
 — of Prague, ii. 325
 Jerusalem, primitive church of, i. 36; destruction of, 43; temple of, abortive attempt to rebuild, 228; conquest and kingdom of, ii. 8; retaken, 96; patriarchate of, iii. 568
 Jesse of Amiens, i. 502
 Jesuates, ii. 284
 Jesuitic corruptions, iii. 270
 Jesuits, foundation, ii. 512; arrival in England, iii. 48; charges against, as missionaries, 185, 186; great success in China, 191; alleged cause of it, 192; in Japan, 196; attacked in cent. XVII., 261; obnoxious in France, 487; banished from Portugal, 488; entangled in commercial difficulties, 489; suppressed in France, *ib.*; in Spain, *ib.*; in other countries, *ib.*; by the pope, *ib.*; protected by Russia and Prussia, 490; restored, 543; provisions against, in the Romish Relief act, 555
 Jesujabus, i. 433, 462
 Jesus Christ, life of, i. 30; birth, 31
 Jetzer, ii. 379
 Jewel, bishop, ii. 460
 Jewish religion, defects of, at the birth of Christ, i. 22; sects, principles of, 23; usages and principles, origin of, among the Christians, 133
 Jews, active hostility of, to Christianity, i. 42, 102; simulated conversions of, 320; compelled to receive baptism, 391; expulsion of, from Spain, ii. 311
 Jezdæans, ii. 548, 549
 Jo. Christian, iii. 245
 Joachim of Flora, mystical work of, ii. 140, 201, 214, 248
 Joanna Eleanora of Meriau, ii. 338
 — papess, i. 532
 Job, first Russian patriarch, ii. 544
 Jacobi, iii. 142
 Joel the chronologer, ii. 171
 Johannelinus, ii. 51
 Johannes, ii. 413
 —, Erasmus, iii. 181
 Johannites, iii. 149
 John the Baptist, i. 32
 John, St., death, i. 39; banishment, 50; immersion in boiling oil, *ib.*
 — of Antioch, i. 341
 — of Jerusalem, i. 256
 — Maxentius, i. 406
 — Moschus, i. 452
 — of Dara, *ib.*

JUD

- John, Scholasticus, i. 411
 — of Cappadocia, i. 410
 — Maro, i. 411
 — of Thessalonica, i. 452
 — of Constantinople, i. 501
 — Cameniata, i. 602
 — Tzirnises, i. 511
 — the Spanish Goth, i. 417
 — deacon at Rome, *ib.*
 — of Euchaita, ii. 48
 — the Sophist, ii. 19
 — Belethus, ii. 133
 — Burgundio, ii. 132
 — of Capua, ii. 591
 — Phocas, ii. 125
 — Scylitzes, ii. 14
 — of Salisbury, ii. 128
 — *Pungens Asinum*, ii. 230
 — de S. Geminiano, ii. 221
 — Cyparissiota, ii. 289
 — Camaterus, ii. 124
 — of Lyons, ii. 136
 — king, ii. 184
 — Cananus, ii. 338
 — Eugenius, *ib.*
 — of Alexandria, *ib.*
 — de Imola, ii. 345
 — John, elector of Saxony, establishes Lutheranism, ii. 407
 — Frederic, misfortunes of, ii. 430
 — George I., iii. 230
 — of Brunswick, iii. 245
 — Sigismund, iii. 306
 — John II., pope, i. 416
 — IV., i. 455
 — VII., i. 501
 — VIII., i. 549
 — X., i. 595
 — XI., *ib.*
 — XII., i. 596
 — XXL, ii. 189, 222
 — XXII., ii. 263, 266
 — works of, ii. 263
 Johnson, Dr., iii. 603
 — Samuel, a New Englander, iii. 529
 Jonas, i. 455
 — of Orleans, i. 548
 Jordan, ii. 220
 Joris, iii. 158, 159
 Jornandes, i. 416
 Joseph, the name assumed by the patriarchs of Romish Armenians, ii. 553
 — Alshaheer, ii. 289
 — of Ephesus, ii. 337
 — of Modon, ii. 338
 — I. king of Portugal, iii. 487
 — II. emperor, iii. 491
 Josephus of Thessalonica, i. 540
 Jovian, i. 228, 385
 Jovinian, i. 280
 Joyce, or Jorsius, Thomas, ii. 292
 Jubilee, institution of, ii. 190; the, instituted, 231; the, altered, 303
 Judaizing Christians, i. 76
 Judas, i. 180

JUL

- Julia Mammæa, i. 158, 174
 Julian, the apostate, opinion of, as to the gods, i. 12; favours the Donatists, 291; his apostasy, 225; history, 296
 — the Pelagian, i. 347
 — of Halicarnassus, i. 400, 429
 — count, i. 482
 Juliana, ii. 231
 Julianus Cæarinus, ii. 345
 — Pomerius, i. 349, 356, 454
 — of Toledo, i. 450, 454, 457
 Julius Africanus, i. 174, 175
 — Firmicus, i. 263
 — pope, assembles the council of Sardica, i. 244; his epistles, 263
 — II., ii. 373
 — III., ii. 515
 — duke of Brunswick, ii. 347
 Jumpers, the, ii. 309
 Junilius, i. 416, 418
 Jurieu, Peter, iii. 360, 361
 Justin Martyr, account of primitive worship by, i. 79; *Apology* by, 104, 117; martyrdom of, 105; history of, 117, 125
 — the Sicilian, i. 343
 Justinian I., literary remains of, i. 415, 421
 — active to convert the Jews, i. 391; recovers Italy, 394
 Justinian's creed, i. 422
 Justinianus, Benedict, ii. 527
 Justus of Urgel, i. 416
 Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, i. 332
 Juvencus, account of, 263

KANT, Emmanuel, iii. 589

- Keith, George, iii. 436, 439
 Kempis, Thomas à, ii. 343
 Kent, conversion of, i. 439
 Kentigern, i. 391
 Kepler, iii. 213
 Kerney, John, iii. 119
 Kilian, St., i. 435, 436
 Kilkenny, statute of, iii. 111; Romish synod of, 402
 Kilwarby, abp. Robert, ii. 222
 Kingly title, first conferred by the popes, ii. 197
 King's college, New York, iii. 529
 Kirkaldy, iii. 71
 Kitchen, bp., ii. 458
 Klein, iii. 26
 Knade, iii. 25
 Knighton, Henry, ii. 297
 Knights' sword-bearers, ii. 91
 Knorr, iii. 217
 Knox, John, particulars of, ii. 469; lands for the last time in Scotland, 476; presents the *First Book of Discipline*, 485; disappointed by the selfish conduct of the nobility, 486; pensioned, 490; his qualities, 493; his use of a liturgy, 494; founder of the Scottish church, iii. 16; sent abroad on the surrender of St. Andrew's, 18; returns, *ib.*; attacked with apoplexy, 67; approves of the Leith agree-

LEG

- ment, 68; refuses to inaugurate Douglas, 69; particulars of his last appearances and death, 72; Morton's character of him, *ib.*; marriages, 75
 Knutzen, iii. 210
 Kodde, van der, iii. 465
 Koran, the, i. 442
 Kortholt, iii. 319
 Krudener, Madame von, iii. 600
 Kuhlman, iii. 217, 344
 Kunrath, Henry, ii. 564

LABADIE, John, iii. 467

- Labarum*, i. 222
 Labbé, Philip, iii. 264, 268
 Lactantius, account of, i. 256, 269
 Laderchi, James de, ii. 522
 Lainez, ii. 513, 515
 Lambecius, iii. 246
 Lambert of Arras, ii. 53
 — of Schafnaberg, ii. 52
 Lambeth Articles, the, iii. 55; admitted in Ireland, 395
 Lami, iii. 268
 Lamoignon, iii. 487
 Lampetians, i. 316
 Lanfranc, ii. 18, 50, 56
 Langres, council of, i. 566
 Langside, battle of, iii. 64
 Langton, Stephen, ii. 185, 214
 Laonicus Chalcocondylas, ii. 339
 Lascaris, Theodore, ii. 213
 Lasco, John a, iii. 26
 Lateran, council of, i. 466; third, 117; under Julius II., ii. 374-376
 Latermann, iii. 328
 Latimer, martyrdom of, ii. 453, 455
 Latin, continued use of, in the liturgy, ii. 75
 Latitudinarians, iii. 379
 La Trappe, iii. 259
Latria, i. 511
 Laud, abp., iii. 236, 365, 366, 372, 397
 Launcelot, iii. 266
 Launoi, iii. 268
Laura, meaning of the term, i. 274, 420
 Laurentius, martyrdom of, i. 164
 — the anti-pope, i. 402
 — of Novara, i. 415; successful experiment of, in Kent, 439
 — Justinianus, ii. 343
Lausiac History, the, i. 253, 339
 Lavardin, iii. 255
 Lazi, conversion of, i. 389
 Leade, Jane, iii. 469
 Leander of Seville, i. 417
 Lebwin, i. 478
 Lecapenus, ii. 289
 Le Clerc, John, iii. 428
 Le Cointe, iii. 265
 Leenhof, iii. 484
 Le Fevre, James, ii. 416
 Legates à latere, ii. 507
 Legates, papal, iniquitous conduct of, in cent. XIII., ii. 167

LEG

- Legatus natus*, the archbishops of Canterbury made, ii. 679
- Leibnitz, iii. 213, 222, 315
- Leidratus, i. 502
- Leipsic, conference of, iii. 309
- Leith, convention of, iii. 66, 69
- Lemmermann, iii. 466
- Lennox, duke of, iii. 84
- earl of, made regent, iii. 64; killed, *ib.*
- Lent, meaning of the term, i. 285; the fast of, *ib.*
- Leo, pope, I. the Great, resists the see of Constantinople, i. 335; endeavours to advance his own see, 342; particulars of him, 344; originates auricular confession, 361
- the Isaurian emperor, i. 493; publishes an edict against images, 508
- of Acris, ii. 48
- of Chalcedon, ii. 60
- Marsicanus, ii. 129
- IV., emperor, i. 510, 511
- the Wise, i. 526, 542, 569, 588, 608
- the Grammarian, ii. 14
- II. pope, i. 456
- III., i. 502
- IV., i. 548
- IX., ii. 21, 23, 52
- X., i. 452, 473, 475, 478; represented as an infidel, 577
- XI., iii. 226
- XII., iii. 574
- Leonard Bruno, ii. 317
- Leonardi, Paruta, iii. 167
- Leonidas, martyrdom of, i. 161, 173
- Leonists, ii. 154
- Leontius, i. 420
- of Antioch, i. 256
- of Byzantium, i. 407
- of Neapolis, i. 411
- Pilatus, i. 256
- Leopold, the emperor, iii. 492
- Leslie, Norman, ii. 470; iii. 18
- Less, Leonard, ii. 555
- Lessons, scriptural, i. 505
- Leszynsky, iii. 209
- Leus, John, iii. 457
- Leuthard, heresy of, i. 611
- Leutheric, ii. 60
- Leverous, bp., iii. 121
- Lewis, the Meek, i. 519, 527, 532, 537, 538, 556, 559, 567
- of Bavaria, ii. 265
- VII., ii. 95
- IX., ii. 165
- XII., iii. 80
- XIII., iii. 348
- XIV., sends a missionary embassy to Siam, iii. 190; founds the academy of sciences, 213; endeavours to make a Romish opening in Abyssinia, 248; interferes for the Jesuits with the Venetians, 250; has contests with the papal court, 252–254; demands reparation for insults offered to his ambassador at Rome, 253; assembles the convention of Paris for the Gallican liberties, 254; maintains his ambassador's right of asylum at Rome, 255;

LUB

- magnificently patronises learning, 263; instigated to disturb the peace of Clement IX., 281; destroys the convent of Port Royal, 286; importuned by Bossuet against Fenelon, 290; revokes the edict of Nantes, 349
- Lewis XVIII., iii. 484
- Libanius, i. 229, 230
- Libellatici*, i. 162
- Libelli Pacis*, *ib.*
- Liber Diurnus*, i. 501
- Liberal Arts, the seven, i. 329
- Liberalism, iii. 564
- Liberatus, i. 413
- Liberius, pope, disturbance at the death of, i. 243; dialogue of, 264; apostasy of, 304
- Libertines*, sect of, iii. 37, 40
- Library, theological, collected by Pamphilus, i. 181
- Lichfield, made archiepiscopal, ii. 80
- Licinianus, i. 417
- Licinianus persecutes the Christians, i. 223
- Lights, annual extinction of, ii. 146
- Limborch, iii. 428
- Lindsey, Theophilus, iii. 512
- Lindwood, ii. 345
- Lisoius, ii. 71
- Litanies, corruption of, i. 425
- Literature, revival of, ii. 315
- Lithuania, forced conversion of, ii. 167; final, 250
- Liturgies, ancient variety of, i. 284; ii. 425; Lutheran, 558
- Liturgy, the English prepared, ii. 448; altered, 450; introduced into Scotland by the reformers, 472; Latin, allowed in Ireland, iii. 120; Scottish opposition to, 399; English, prohibited, 401; English, in century XIX., 619
- Livonia converted, ii. 91
- Locke, John, iii. 223
- Lollard*, etymology of, ii. 285, 286
- Lollards, ii. 274
- Lollard, Walter, ii. 286, 307
- Lombard, Nicholas, iii. 193
- Eugene, iii. 255
- Lombards, kingdom of, founded, i. 394; overthrown, 491
- Long Parliament, the, iii. 400
- Longinus, i. 166
- Loquis, ii. 354
- Lord of Ireland*, injurious effects of the title, iii. 109; abolished, 112; this recognised at Rome, 115
- Lord's Supper converted into a sacrifice, i. 133
- Lothaire, i. 528
- Loubere, iii. 190, 191
- Louis XVIII., iii. 577.
- Louis-Philippe, *ib.*
- Louisa le Gras, iii. 261
- Louvigni, iii. 289
- Love, alderman, iii. 410
- Love-feasts, abolition of, i. 360
- Low church, iii. 382
- Loyola, ii. 513; canonised, iii. 293
- Lubieniezky, iii. 463

LUB

- Lubin, iii. 317, 319
 Lucan, or Lucian, i. 143
 Lucaris, iii. 295
 Lucas Chrysoberges, ii. 125
 — of Tuy, ii. 220
 Lucas, iii. 212
 Lucian, presbyter of Antioch, i. 181, 188
 Lucifer of Cagliari, or Caralitanus, i. 264, 278
 Luciferians, *ib*
 Lucius, king, application of, to Rome, i. 96
 — II., pope, ii. 112, 132
 — III., 117, 134
 Lucopetrus, ii. 147
 Ludger, i. 547
 Ludolf, Job, iii. 301
 Ludolphus Saxo, ii. 294
 Luitprand, the historian, i. 591
 Lupoldus Babenbergius, ii. 295
 Lupus of Troyes, i. 347
 Lusignan, Guy de, ii. 96
 Luther, early history, ii. 385; preaches against indulgences, 386; his reason, *ib*.; not incited by envy, 387; attacked by polemics, 388; summoned to Rome, 389; confers with Cajetan, *ib*.; appeals from the pope, 390; has interviews with Miltitz, 391; disputes with Eckius, 392; condemned by the pope, 395; burns the bull and the body of papal canons, 396; excommunicated, 397; founds a new church, *ib*.; appears before the diet at Worms, 398; proscribed, *ib*.; conveyed to the castle of Wartburg, *ib*.; returns to Wittenberg, 399; translates the Bible, 401; his opinion of the eucharist, 402; made clerical visitor for Saxony Proper, 409; writes his catechisms, *ib*.; attends the conference of Marburg, 410; invited to Denmark, 413; receives an overture from Bohemia, 418; at Coburg, during the diet of Augsburg, 419; doubts the propriety of making the league of Smalcald, 423; draws up the *Articles of Smalcald*, 426; dies, 430
 Lutheranism established, ii. 406; legally tolerated by the diet of Augsburg, in 1555, iii. 435
 Lütkemann, iii. 342
 Lutzen, battle of, iii. 232
 Lydgate, ii. 345
 Lyons, persecution of, i. 105; poor men of, ii. 154; council of, 1245, 187; 1274, 188
 Lyranus, Nicolaus, ii. 291, 298
 Lyser, iii. 317, 319

MAR

- Magic, allowable, i. 112
 Magni, Jacobus, ii. 298
 Mahomet, rise and particulars of, i. 442; death 444; *Testament of*, 462
 Mai, cardinal, iii. 575
 Maigrot, Charles, iii. 193
 Maillard, ii. 350
 Maimbourg, iii. 268
 Mainhard, ii. 91
 Mainwaring, iii. 397
 Majoli, St., clerks of, ii. 520
 Major friars, ii. 195
 — George, ii. 576
 — William, ii. 222
 Majorinus, i. 288
 Malachias, ii. 293
 Malagrida, iii. 488
 Malala, John, i. 452
 Malan, iii. 600
 Malavalle, iii. 289
 Malchion, i. 181, 207
 Malchus, i. 343
 Maldonate, ii. 522
 Malebranche, iii. 206
 Malmesbury, William of, attacks Raban Maur, i. 542
 Malta, knights of, ii. 98
 Mammias, ii. 338
 Mamun, Al, i. 527
 Man, nature of, according to the Gnostics, i. 55
 Mandagot, ii. 292
 Manes, i. 198
 Manichæans, severe laws against, i. 287
 Manichæism, nature of, i. 203
 Mansel's *Bampton Lectures*, iii. 621
 Mansfield, Lord, iii. 518
 Mantua, proclamation for council at, ii. 425
 Mantz, iii. 141
 Manuel, Chrysoloras, ii. 253, 256
 — Comnenus, ii. 143
 — of Constantinople, ii. 239
 Manumission, form of, used in baptism, i. 134
 Mapes, Walter, ii. 174
 Maphæus, ii. 346
 Maphrian, i. 429; ii. 547
 Mar, earl of, dies, iii. 64
 Maravia, iii. 189
 Marca, Peter de, iii. 334
 Marcella, martyrdom of, i. 161
 Marcellinus, i. 347, 416
 Marcellus of Ancyra, i. 255, 309
 Marcellus, Henry, iii. 239
 Marchia, James of, ii. 358
 Marcianists, i. 316
 Marcion, i. 143
 Marcosians, i. 149
 Marculphus, i. 454
 Marcus, i. 256, 341, 454
 — friend of Athanasius, i. 256
 — of Ephesus, ii. 352
 Mardaites, i. 469
 Mareschalens, ii. 348
 Maresius, iii. 383
 Marets, des, iii. 383
 Margaret of Navarre, ii. 415

MAANES, i. 371

- Mabillon, iii. 264
 Macarii, the, i. 253, 254
 Macarius, i. 253, 271, 452, 529; ii. 336
 Maccovius, iii. 38
 Macedonius, i. 311
 Macrianus, i. 163
 Macrobius, i. 264
 Madrucci, or Madrusius, ii. 537
 Madura, iii. 189
 Magian system, i. 51

MAR

Margiana, i. 473
 Maria Theresa, iii. 486
 Marianus Scotus, ii. 49, 50
 Marinus Sanutus, ii. 293
 Marius, i. 417
 — Mercator, i. 345
 Mark of Ephesus, ii. 329
 — of Memphis, i. 313
 Maro, Jo., i. 469
 Maronites, i. 469; ii. 554
 Marozia, i. 595
 Marpurg, conference of, ii. 404, 410; iii. 6
 Marriages, clerical, allowed in cent. III., i. 171;
 obligatory among the Nestorians, 372; fourth,
 608
 Marsilius of Padua, ii. 280; ab Ingen, 297;
 Ficinus, 317, 348
 Martene, iii. 265
 Martial, alleged apostleship of, ii. 66
 Martin of Tours, i. 233; extravagant views of
 the priesthood entertained by, 335; of Pan-
 nonia, 416; Polanus, 175; Magister, ii. 348;
 pope, 378, 389; IV., 189; V., 327
 Martini, Raymund, ii. 176
 Martyr, Peter, ii. 439
Martyria, i. 283
 Martyrologies, i. 47
 Martyrs, meaning of the term, i. 45; different
 opinions as to the number of, 46; early
 commemorations of, 78; immediate reception
 of, into heaven, 125; letters of, 162
 Mary, the Virgin, worship of, in cent. IV., i.
 318; and in century X., 610; the Rosary or
 Crown of St. Mary, 610
 — queen of England, first acts of, in
 Ireland, as sovereign, and supreme head of
 the church, iii. 114; applies for papal recog-
 nition of her royal title there, 115; her
 authority for a persecution unexpectedly
 rendered useless, 116
 — of Guise, regent of Scotland, courts the
 Protestants, ii. 466; throws off the mask,
 273, 475; enters Perth, 477; fortifies Leith,
 479; suspended from the regency, *ib.*;
 death, 480; accession to the regency, iii. 18
 — queen of Scots, assumes the English arms,
 ii. 456; returns to Scotland, 488; obtains a
 toleration for herself, 491; marries Bothwell,
ib.; abdicates, 492; escapes from Lochleven,
 iii. 64
 Mass, canon of, i. 425
 Massacre, Irish, iii. 402
 Massenius, iii. 239
 Masses for the dead, rise of, i. 287; private,
 first traces of, 514; in honour of saints, 572
 Massilians, i. 385
 Massuet, iii. 265
 Master of the sentences, ii. 127
 Masters, academical, ii. 173, 174
 Mathematical philosophy, iii. 221
 Matilda, the countess, ii. 30
 Matthew, *Florilegus*, or of Westminster, ii.
 297
 Matthewes' Bible, ii. 442
 Matthias, John, iii. 311

MEL

Matthias, election of, i. 34; a pretended Gnostic
 authority, 85
Matthuring, ii. 192
 Maty, iii. 484
 Maur, St., French congregation of, iii. 257
 Maurice of Hesse, secession of, from the Luther-
 ans, iii. 305
 — prince of Orange, iii. 423, 425, 428
 — duke of Saxony, ii. 430, 433, 434
 — Mr., iii. 621
 Mauritius de Portu, ii. 351
 Maurus, St., i. 406
 — of Ravenna, i. 449
 Maxentius, John, i. 406
 Maximilian, death of, ii. 397
 Maximilla, i. 155
 Maximin, persecution under, i. 161
 Maximinus, author of a schism among the
 Donatists, i. 292; of Anazarbum, 342
 Maximus, i. 123, 237, 451, 457, 458
 — of Ephesus, i. 237
 — of Turin, i. 344
 — of Riez, i. 348
 — Planudes, ii. 254
 Mayer, Michael, iii. 217
 Mayhew, Thomas, iii. 203, 205
 Mayron, Francis, ii. 290
 Mazen, ii. 333
 Mechtildis, ii. 222
 Meder, ii. 351
 Meffrethus, ii. 346
 Meier, Lewis, iii. 212
 Meisner, iii. 318, 319
 Melancthon, witness of the disputation between
 Luther and Eck, ii. 392; his character, 393;
 account of him, 394; too timid to restrain
 Carlstadt, 400; publishes in favour of the
 real presence, 404; made clerical visitor of
 Misnia, 409; attends the conference of Mar-
 purg, 410; draws up the confession of
 Augsburg, 411; draws up a reply to the
 papal refutation of it, 422; sought to be
 gained by the papal party, 423; draws up an
 article on the papal supremacy, 326; confers
 with Eckius at Worms, 429; gives rise to
 the Adiaphoristic controversy, 432; sets out
 for Trent, 433; head of a branch of Peripa-
 tetics, 502; sends a copy of the Augsburg
 confession to the Greeks, 544; makes altera-
 tions in that confession, 560, 561; cultivates
 history, 561; the mainspring of Lutheran
 literature, *ib.*; at first adverse to philosophy,
 562; an *electric*, *ib.*; reduces Lutheran theo-
 logy to a system, 566; death, 568; his
 differences with Luther, 573, 574; his
 changes of opinion, 576
 Melchides, i. 289
 Melchites, i. 429; iii. 567
 Meletians, i. 276, 300
 Meletius, i. 243, 276
 — of Sebaste, i. 256
 — of Mopsuestia, i. 342
 Melissenus, ii. 338
 Meliteniota, Constantine, ii. 213
 Melitians, i. 192

MEL

- Melito, works of, i. 123, 126
 Melville, Andrew, early history, iii. 74; engaged upon the *Second Book of Discipline*, 74; speaks against prelacy, 75; his alleged incompetence, 76, 77; Morton's opinion of him, 79; boldly signs at Perth, 83; flees into England, 88; sees the *Basilicon Doron*, 105; his final history, 106
 Menander, i. 89
 Menard, iii. 268
 Mendæans, ii. 549
Mendai Ijahi, *ib.*
 Mendez, Alphonso, iii. 247
 Mendicants, institution of, ii. 191; contests of, with the university of Paris, 197
 Menezes, ii. 510
 Menno, Simonis, iii. 138, 144, 148
 Mennonites, iii. 136, 146, 148, 152; refined, 457; gross, *ib.*, 458
 Mensurius, i. 288
 Mentzer, iii. 317
 Mercator, i. 536
 Mercia, conversion of, i. 440
 Mercurius, Francis, iii. 217
 Merindol, ii. 416
 Messalians, i. 316; ii. 147
 Metaphrastes, i. 601
 Metaphysical philosophy, iii. 21
 Methodists, Romish, iii. 242; Anglican, origin of the name, 503; difference between, 509
 Methodius, i. 176, 188, 189, 521
 — of Constantinople, i. 540
 Metochita, George, ii. 208
 — Theodore, ii. 254
 Metrophanes, i. 541
 Metropolitans, i. 59, 116, 239; introduced into Scotland, ii. 597
 Meyer, Gebhard, Theodore, iii. 317
 Mezzabarba, iii. 473
 Mezzofanti, cardinal, iii. 575
 Michael, St. churches dedicated to, in century X., i. 612
 Michael Psellus, i. 526, 541; ii. 15, 48
 — Syncellus, i. 540
 — the monk, i. 541
 — Cerularius, ii. 48
 — Attaliata, *ib.*
 — of Thessalonica, ii. 125
 — de Mediolano, ii. 348
 Michaelis, iii. 588
 Micrologus, ii. 53
 Middleton, Conyers, attack upon miracles by, i. 100; death of, *ib.*
 — Richard, ii. 217
 — bishop, iii. 558
 Milan, edict of, in favour of the Christians, i. 218
 Military orders, ii. 97
 Milk and honey, religious use of, among Christians, i. 134, 137
 Millenary year, dread of, i. 605
 Millennium, i. 191; taught by Cerinthus, 92; expected by some in cent. XVII., iii. 238, 333
 Milletierre, iii. 239

MOR

- Miltiades, i. 123
 Miltitz, ii. 391
 Mingrelian church, the, ii. 544
 Minor friars, ii. 195
 Minorea, forced conversion of the Jews in, i. 321
 Minorites, ii. 195
 Minucius Felix, i. 179, 188
 Miollis, iii. 542
 Miracle, alleged African, to confute Arianism, i. 364
 Miracles, Jansenist, iii. 278, 284
 Miraculous gifts, continuance of, i. 99; controversy upon, 100
 Mislena, iii. 328
 Missals, variety of, i. 525
Missi, i. 495, 537
 Missions, priests of, iii. 261
 Mithras identified with Christ, i. 200, 202
 Modestus, i. 123
 Mogilaus, Peter, ii. 541
 Molina, iii. 274, 275
 — Lewis, ii. 536
 Molinists, ii. 536
 Molinos, Michael de, iii. 287
 Monachism, uncertain date of its introduction into Europe, i. 273; less severe than the Asiatic, 273; particular forms of, 274; all monks originally laymen, *ib.*
 Monaldus, ii. 294, 301
 Monarchians, i. 152
Monarchy, Sicilian, ii. 5
 Monasteries, ancient benefits of, i. 406; plundered by the Normans, 525; originally not interfered with by the pope, 598
 Monastic garb assumed at the point of death, i. 536
 Moneta, ii. 149
 Monk, origin of the term, i. 274
 Monks, early condition of, i. 336
 Monluck, bishop of Valence, iii. 125
 Monophysites, i. 377, 378; ii. 545, 546; prosperity of, i. 428
 Monotheletism, i. 464, 467
 Montagne, Michael le, ii. 499
 Montague, Richard, iii. 365
 Montanism, i. 153
 Montanus, i. 153
 — of Toledo, i. 416
 — Arias, ii. 522
 Monte Corvino, John de, ii. 162, 250
Montenses, i. 289
 Montesono, ii. 302
 Montfaucon, iii. 265
 Montgomery, Robert, appointed to Glasgow, iii. 83
 Montpelier, ii. 103
 Montrose, assembly of, iii. 107
 Moore, abp., iii. 531
 Moors, establishment of, in Spain, i. 482
 Moravia, converted, i. 521, 522
 Moravianism, iii. 26
 More, Henry, iii. 160
 — Sir Thomas, ii. 446
 Morigia, ii. 520

MOR

- Morin, iii. 265
 Moriscoes, feigned conversion of, ii. 312; expulsion of, iii. 235
 Mormonites, iii. 625
 Morton, earl of, succeeds to the regency, iii. 64; obtains a surrender of their thirds from the clergy, 65; obtains the archbishopric of St. Andrews's for Douglas, 69; speech of, at Knox's funeral, 72; his able regency, 79
 Mosaical prejudices among Christians, i. 76
 Moschamper, ii. 214
 Moses of Crete, i. 321
 — Barcepha, i. 540, 602
 Moslems, iii. 567
 Mothe, de la, le Vayer, iii. 224
 Mother of God, the phrase, i. 366, 371
 Mozarabic liturgy, ii. 67
 Mugellanus, ii. 292
 Mühlberg, battle of, ii. 431
 Mulhausen, battle of, ii. 405
 Müller, Henry, iii. 318, 320
 — John, iii. 318, 320
 Munster, Anabaptist outrages at, ii. 426; iii. 143
 Münzer, ii. 405; iii. 140
 Murray, the regent's assassination, iii. 64
 Musæus, iii. 318, 319, 328
 Musanus, i. 123
 Musculus, iii. 345
 Mutianus Scholasticus, i. 416
 Mylne, Walter, ii. 467
 Mysteries, Pagan, i. 15; the term adopted by Christians, 133; scriptural, 352
 Mystery, apostolic use of the term, i. 70
 Mystic theology, origin of, i. 184; alleged origin, 191
 Mystical world, i. 187
 Mystics, i. 356; origin of, 113, 555; services of, in cent. XVI., ii. 383; Romish, 529

- NAG'S-HEAD** tavern, ii. 460
 Name, papal change of, i. 596
 Nangis, William of, ii. 175, 176, 292
 Nantes, edict of, iii. 15, 18; revoked, 349
 Naples, origin of papal claims over, i. 238; anti-Romish commotions in, ii. 439
 Napoleon III., iii. 528
 Narcissus, i. 180, 185
 Narnius, iii. 183
 Narses, i. 393
 Nassau, William of, ii. 438
 Natalis, Alexander, iii. 267
 — Peter, ii. 347
 Natrassians, i. 152
 Nature, living according to, and above, i. 129
 Naucerus, ii. 351
 Naucratus, i. 540
 Nayler, James, iii. 435
 Nazarenes, i. 92, 139
 Neal's history, character of, iii. 43
 Nebrissensis, ii. 349
Necessary Doctrine, ii. 443
 Neckam, Alexander, ii. 220
 Neckar, iii. 494

NIC

- Necromancy, i. 112
 Nectarius, i. 244
 Neercassel, iii. 282
 Negative confession, the, iii. 82
 Nemesius of Emesda, i. 256
 Nennius, i. 455
 Neophytus, ii. 102
 Nepos, a writer for the Millennium, i. 192
 Nerius, Philip, ii. 520
 Nero said to have been originally favourable to Christianity, i. 40; persecution of, 43
 Nessel, iii. 246
 Nestor, ii. 102
 Nestorian missions, ii. 4
 Nestorians, origin of, i. 366; alleged principles of, 369; authorised principles of, 373; Persian patronage of, 371; establishment of, 427; called Chaldeans, ii. 12; peculiarities of, 15; intercourse of, with Rome, 587; iii. 303; in century XIX., iii. 568
 Nestorianus, i. 343
 Nestorius, particulars and opinions of, i. 341, 365, 367, 369
 Netherlands, Protestant movements in, ii. 418, 439; church in, in century XIX., iii. 583
 Netter, Thomas, iii. 44
 Neubrigensis, William, ii. 134
 New England, settlement of, iii. 203; missions in, 204
 New Testament, canon of, established early, i. 65; apocryphal, *ib.*; ancient versions of, 98
 New theologists, ii. 139
 Newburg, conference of, iii. 237, 238
 Newman, J. H., iii. 605
 Newton, Isaac, iii. 213, 222, 223
 Nicæas, i. 353
 Nice, first council of, summoned by Constantine, i. 297, 338; canon of, unfavourable to the popedom, 243; second council of, 511
 Nicene-deutero decrees, rejection of, in England, i. 512
 Nicephoras, i. 539
 — Chartophylax, i. 540
 — Logotheta, *ib.*
 — Bryennius, ii. 102
 — Blemmida, ii. 172, 213
 — Gregoras, ii. 253
 — Callistus, ii. 254
 Nicetas, David, i. 540
 — Pectoratus, ii. 48
 — Serron, *ib.*
 — Seidus, ii. 124
 — Byzantinus, *ib.*
 — Choniates, ii. 171
 — Acominatus, ii. 213, 228
 — Maronita, ii. 214
 Nicetius, i. 415
 Nicholas, Czar, iii. 566
 — Henry, iii. 160
 — of Hussinetz, ii. 353, 354
 Nicias, i. 459
 Nicodemus the Ethiopian, ii. 338
 Nicolai, Henry, iii. 159
 Nicolaitans, i. 89

NTC

Nicolaus, pope, i. 549; excommunicated by Photius, 568
 — II., ii. 23, 52
 — III., ii. 189
 — IV., *ib.*, 222
 — V., ii. 265; iii. 27
 — Mysticus, i. 541
 — Grammaticus, ii. 49
 — of Clairvaux, ii. 132
 — de Gorham, ii. 298
 — Auximanus, Picena, ii. 345
 — Simonis, ii. 349
 — de Nyse, *ib.*
 Nicole, iii. 266, 273, 277
 — Peter, iii. 243
 Nicon, i. 601
 Nieder, John, ii. 301
 Niem, de, Theodoric, ii. 344
 Nihusius, iii. 242
 Nilus, i. 339; ii. 288
 — Doxopatrius, ii. 48; account of ecclesiastical divisions by, in cent. XI., i. 239–242
 Ninian, i. 391
 Nisibis, school of, i. 371
 Nithandus, i. 548
 Noailles, abp., iii. 476
 Nobili, Robert de, iii. 187
 Noëtus, i. 204
 Nogaret, ii. 262
 Noll, Henry, iii. 217
 Nominalists, ii. 19, 107; and Realists, revived contests of, 258; doctrine of, prohibited, ii. 318
 Nonjurors, iii. 381, 382
 Nonnosus, i. 410
 Nonnus, i. 341
 Norbert, ii. 122
 Noris, Henry, iii. 187
 Normandy, conversion of, i. 580
 Normans, progress of, i. 524, 525
 Northumbria, conversion of, i. 440
 Norway converted, i. 583; church in, in century XIX., iii. 599
Notaries, i. 576
 Nothingus, i. 563
 Notker, i. 591
 Notkerus Balbulus, i. 607
 Nova Scotia, bishopric of, iii. 557
 Novatian, i. 180, 208
 Novatians, the, i. 208, 300
 Novatus, i. 208
 Nun, origin of the term, i. 274
 Nuremberg, truce of, ii. 425; ratification of the peace of Westphalia at, iii. 227
Nurture of infants, iii. 111
Nus, i. 146

ORI

Ochino, or Ochin, Bernardine, first general of the Capuchins, ii. 500, 578; iii. 42, 167, 168
 O'Connell, Mr. Daniel, iii. 549
 Oda, i. 581
 Odilo, abbot of Cluny; i. 603, 609
 Odo of Cambrai, ii. 18, 20, 129
 — of Cluny, i. 600, 602
 Odoacer, i. 319
Economical, i. 127, 189
 — technical use of the term, i. 127, 189
Ecumenism of Tricca, i. 601
 Offa, ii. 79
 Office, the lesser, i. 610
 Oglethorpe, bp., ii. 457
 Olaus, i. 584
 Olbert, i. 603
 Oldenbarnevelt, iii. 421, 423
 Olearius, iii. 317, 319
 Oliva, Peter John, ii. 204, 275
 Olympia, iii. 226
 Olympiodorus, i. 237, 327, 330, 408, 601
 O'Morgair, Malachy, iii. 109
 'Ομοούσιος, i. 297, 302
 'Ομφαλόψυχοι, ii. 305
 O'Neil, John, or Shaue, iii. 122
 — Hugh, iii. 133; Protestant compliance of, 134; submission of, *ib.*
 Ophites, i. 150
 Optatus of Milevi, i. 259
Opus operatum, ii. 533
 Oracles, Pagan, Mosheim's varying opinions upon, i. 19
 Oral law, account of, i. 25
 Orange, William, prince of, tolerant views of, iii. 155
 Oratory, Fathers of, ii. 520; of the holy Jesus, iii. 260
 Ordeals, i. 572
Order, ancient monastic use of the term, i. 601
 Oredic Vitalis, ii. 131
 Orders, minor, introduction of, i. 170
 Ordinal, the English, prepared, ii. 448
 Oresimus, ii. 296
 Organisation, church, question of, iii. 593
 Oriental church, division of, ii. 539
 — languages taught under authority of Clement V., ii. 255
 Orientius, i. 415
 — or Orontius, i. 353
 Origen, history of, i. 172; becomes a new Platonist, 114; amalgamates Platonism with Christianity, 167, 182; his enumeration of fundamentals, 183; a disseminator of the Scriptures, 159; converts an Arabian tribe, *ib.*; principal errors attributed to him, 174; seeks recondite senses in Scripture, 185; writes upon martyrdom, 188; ordained and deprived, 193; contests about him, *ib.*; confutes Beryllus, 206; the first known regular preacher, 194; claimed by the Arians, 281; defended by Eusebius, *ib.*; admired by the monks, *ib.*; his opinion of the Trinity, 293; thought a favourer of Pelagianism, 382; condemned in the fifth general council 420, 423; his errors, 421

OATH exacted from Romanist members of parliament, iii. 554
 Oblations in primitive times, i. 60, 63, 80
 Observants, ii. 202, 284
 Occam, or Ockham, William, ii. 281, 282; condemned by the university of Paris, 258
 Occasional conformity, iii. 498

ORI

Origen, junior, i. 181
 Origenists, i. 282
 Orkneys converted, i. 584
 Orleans, persecution at, ii. 71
 Ormond, earl of, iii. 124, 129, 130
 Ormuzd, i. 200
 Orosius, i. 325, 343
 Orthodoxy, feast of, i. 558
 Osbern, ii. 86
 Osiander, ii. 579; iii. 318, 320, 344
 Ostorodt, iii. 176
 Ostrogoths, kingdom of, in Italy, i. 319
 Ostrorog, iii. 27
 Oswald, i. 439; ii. 82
 Oswy, absurd conclusion of, in favour of Rome, i. 439
 Othmar, i. 478
 Otto of Frisingen, ii. 132
 Otto of Bamberg, ii. 89; his mode of baptising, 90
 — the Great, i. 584
 Oxford movement, iii. 605

PACCA, cardinal, iii. 542
 Pachomius, i. 256, 336
 Pachymeres, George, ii. 171
 Pacianus, i. 264, 269
 Pagan gods, real nature of, i. 12; usages, origin of, among Christians, 133
 Paganism, originally the canonisation of Noah and his family, i. 13; extended to various other objects, 14; worship arising from, *ib.*; civil, 17; military, *ib.*; made penal, 224; temporarily revived at Rome, 320; incorporated with Christianity, 351; made capital, ii. 13
 Pajon, Claude, iii. 360, 361
 Palæologus, the emperor, John, ii. 301
 — James, iii. 181
 Palamas, Gregory, ii. 288
 Palatinate, religious changes in, iii. 14
 Palatine school, i. 485
 Palatines, persecution of, iii. 350
 Pale, the English, iii. 109
 Palestine monks, contests among, respecting Origen, i. 420
 Palladius of Galatia, i. 253, 339
 — the Irish missionary, i. 323
 Pallavicini, iii. 292
 Pallium, the (pall), ii. 508
 Palls, first appearance of, in Ireland, iii. 109
 Palmerius, ii. 346
 Paludanus, Peter, ii. 294
 Pamelius, ii. 523
 Pamphilus, the martyr, i. 181; the collector of a valuable theological library, *ib.*; account of, 253
 Panagiota, ii. 542
 Pandects, the, discovered, ii. 104
 Pandulf, ii. 185
 Panormitanus, ii. 317, 346
 Pantænus, i. 95; philosophical particulars of, 109; his works lost, 123, 125
 Pantheism, i. 112

PAU

Pantheists, iii. 211
 Papacy, early steps to exalt the, i. 335; foundation of, 387
 Paparo, John, iii. 109
 Papebroch, iii. 268
 Paphnutius, opposition of, to enforced clerical celibacy, works of, 256, 301
 Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, i. 122, 126
 Papin, Isaac, iii. 361
 Papists excluded from parliament, iii. 410
 Paracelsists, ii. 563
 Paracelsus, ii. 500
 Paraclete, claim of names, to be the, i. 202
 Paradiso, de, ii. 347
 Paraguay, iii. 203
 Pardulphus, St., i. 481
 Paris, foundation of the church of, i. 160; the school of, ii. 103; the principal school of theology in cent. XII., 138; the first university, 173; counsel of, 559
 — Matthew, ii. 175
 — William of, ii. 217, 292
 — John of, ii. 219
 — convention of, for the Gallican liberties, iii. 195
 — Abbé de, iii. 279, 285; supposed miracles at his tomb, 478
 Parker, abp., early history, ii. 459; consecration, 459; his principles, iii. 58
 Parma, John of, ii. 200, 202
 Parpaglia, ii. 463
 Partibus, bishops *in*, ii. 540
 Pasagini, or Passigii, ii. 158
 Pascal, iii. 266, 271, 277
 Paschal II., pope, i. 547; ii. 53, 109
 — III., ii. 114
 Paschal controversy, i. 135; terminated at Nice, 300
 Paschasius of Rome, i. 415
 — Radbert, i. 561, 567
 Passion, instruments of, festival of, ii. 303
 Passive obedience, iii. 382
 Paterini, ii. 33, 70
 Paterius, i. 454
 Patmos, Luther's, ii. 398
 Paton, bp., iii. 78
 Patriarchates, five, i. 241, 332
 Patriarchs, i. 239; origin of, 116; Romish theory of, 59
 Patrick, St., i. 323; life and works of, 348
 Patripassians, i. 152, 204, 206
 Patronage, origin of the right of, i. 284
 Paul, St., apostleship of, i. 36; dates respecting, 39; death of, 47; missionary in Gaul, 162
 — of Samosata, i. 181, 207
 — the Hermit, i. 184
 — of Emesa, i. 342
 — Warnefrid, the Deacon, i. 500
 — I., pope, i. 502
 — II., ii. 332
 — III., ii. 515
 — IV., *ib.*; intemperate conduct of, ii. 456
 — V., iii. 226, 249, 250, 274, 275
 Pauli, George, iii. 170
 Paulians, or Paulianists, i. 445

PAU

- Paulicians, i. 574; their doctrines, 517; persecuted, 462; their migrations, 611; ii. 70
- Paulinus, i. 439
- of Nola, i. 260, 344
- Petricordius, i. 348
- of Aquileia, i. 500
- Paulus Carthagena, ii. 344
- Peacock, bp., ii. 345, 346
- Peada, i. 440
- Peckham, abp., John, ii. 217
- Peel, Sir Robert, iii. 551
- Peking, ii. 250
- Pelagianism, i. 330, 380
- Pelagius, i. 379, 382
- I., pope, i. 400, 416
- II., i. 416.
- Pelbartus Osvaldus, ii. 351
- Penitential doctrine, primitive, i. 75; abp. Theodore's, 459
- Penn, William, iii. 438
- Pennafort, Raymond, of, iii. 293
- Pennsylvania, iii. 438
- Pentecost, Mosheim's apparent opinion as to the day of, i. 35; early observance of, 78
- Pepusians, i. 155
- Perald, William, ii. 218
- Perauld, iii. 272
- Peregrine ministers*, iii. 91, 92
- Perezius, ii. 347
- Perieres, des, ii. 499
- Peripatetics, iii. 216
- Perkins, William, iii. 39
- Perpetua, martyrdom of, i. 161
- Perron, cardinal, iii. 268
- Perrot, Sir John, iii. 131, 134
- Persecutio, pagan variations in, i. 45
- Persecutions, Ten, the, i. 43
- Persia, retreat of the philosophers into, i. 398
- Persons, Robert, iii. 49; views of, as to Romish episcopacy in England, iii. 293
- Perth, Protestant worship introduced into, ii. 476; outrage in, *ib.*; assembly of, iii. 44; articles of, 372
- Peter, St., travels of, i. 39; death of, 47
- a name assumed by the Maronite patriarch, ii. 555
- de Albano, ii. 178
- of Alexandria, i. 246
- of Antioch, ii. 48
- of Blois, ii. 129
- of Cassino, ii. 131
- Cellensis, ii. 134
- Commestor, ii. 129
- son of Cassiodorus, ii. 221
- Chrysologus, i. 344
- Damian, ii. 49
- the deacon, i. 415
- de Dusburg, ii. 294
- the Fuller, i. 376
- Grossolanus, ii. 129
- Lombard, ii. 127
- Moggus, i. 376, 377
- Siculus, i. 540, 575
- the Venerable, ii. 108, 130
- de Vineis, ii. 170, 220

PHR

- Peter I., Russian reforms of, iii. 299
- Petersen, iii. 339
- Peterson, Olaus, ii. 412
- Petilianus, works of, i. 265
- Petit, John, ii. 326
- Petition, monastic, i. 405
- Petrarch, ii. 250
- Petri, ii. 411
- Petrikow, synod of, iii. 169
- Petrobrussians, ii. 151
- Petrucchi, iii. 289
- Petrus Alfonsus, ii. 129
- Jeremiae, ii. 345
- Petzel, ii. 582
- Peucer, Caspar, *ib.*
- Pyrere, iii. 291
- Pfaff, Chr. Matth., iii. 482
- Pfeiffer, iii. 245, 318, 319
- Pflug, Julius, ii. 431
- Phæbadius, i. 264
- Phantasiastæ, i. 430
- Pharisees, principles of scriptural interpretation holden by, i. 25
- Philadelphia, iii. 438
- Philadelphian Society, iii. 469
- Philastrius of Brescia, i. 262
- Philip, son of Herod, i. 22
- Augustus, ii. 97; his matrimonial troubles, 184
- the Fair, ii. 261, 309
- Herveng, ii. 131
- de Leidas, ii. 296
- de monte Calerio, ii. 295
- of Side, i. 341
- Solitarius, ii. 123
- of Tarentum, ii. 131
- II., ii. 438; makes hostile attempts upon Ireland, iii. 129
- Philippicus Bardanes, i. 507
- Philippists, ii. 577
- Philippus, the commentator on Job, i. 349
- Decius, ii. 352
- Philips, the, favour to the Christians shown by, i. 158
- Philoponists, i. 431
- Philoponus, John, i. 394, 398; account of, 431
- Philosophers, injurious to Christianity, i. 102; ambition to be thought, among Christians, 190, 129
- Philosophic theologians, ii. 138
- Philosophical sin, ii. 532; iii. 271, 272
- Philosophy, division of, into Grecian and Oriental, i. 18; division of, in cent. XII., ii. 106; in cent. XIX., iii. 588
- Philostorgius, i. 341
- Philostratus, i. 165
- Philotheus, i. 228, 296
- Philoxenus, i. 430
- Phocas, i. 411, 448
- Phæbadius, i. 264
- Photinus, i. 310
- Photius, i. 526, 539, 553; excommunicated by the pope, 568; imprudent, 570
- Phranza, ii. 336

PHR

Phrygians, a name for the Montanists, i. 155
 Phthartolatræ, i. 432
 Phundaites, ii. 148
 Piarists, iii. 261
 Picards, ii. 362
 Piccolominiæus, Jac., ii. 347
 Pictet, Benedict, iii. 353
 Picts and Scots, conversion of, i. 390; Romish conformity of, ii. 78
 Picus, John Francis, ii. 317, 349
 Pierius, presbyter of Alexandria, i. 181
 Pietistic controversy, iii. 320, 323, 329
 Pietists, origin of the name, iii. 329; persecuted, 333; in Switzerland, 600
 Pighi, ii. 594
 Pilate, alleged privy of, to Christ's resurrection, and transmission of the fact by, to the emperor, i. 40
 Pilgrimages, beginning of, i. 266, 351; female, evils of, 503
 Pillichdorf, ii. 346
 Pillar-Saints, i. 356
 Pin, L. Ellies du, iii. 270
 Pinzcovia, iii. 169
 Pipin, i. 489, 490
 Pirckheimer, ii. 379
 Pirmin, i. 478
 Piscator, iii. 356
 Pisidius, or Possidonius, of Calama, i. 347
 Pistorius, John, ii. 560
 Pitt, William, iii. 516, 519; encouragement given by, to the Romish claims, iii. 546;
 Pius II., ii. 330, 347; writes to Mahomet II., 314
 — IV., ii. 463, 515
 — V., ii. 216
 — VI., undertakes a journey to Vienna, iii. 491; death, 497
 — VII., iii. 443, 448-454, 574
 — VIII., iii. 575
 — IX., *ib.*
 Place, Joshua de la, iii. 359
 Placentia, council of, ii. 6
 Placette, John la, iii. 353
 Placidus, i. 406
 Platina, Bartholomew, ii. 348
 Plato, doctrines of, i. 20; thought conformable to Gnosticism, 53; popularity of, among Christians, 109
 Platonic philosophy revived, iii. 220
 Platonics, popularity of, among Christians, i. 129; the new, 109, 110
 Platonism, essential doctrines of, i. 167; new, evils of, 114, 129
 Platonists, persecution of, i. 237
 Pleroma, i. 54
 Pliny, letter of, to Trajan, i. 94
 Pliny's principle, ii. 325
 Plotinus, i. 166, 167, 197
 Pluralities, ii. 76
 Plutarch, i. 108, 167, 330
 Pneumatomachi, i. 311
 Podoniptæ, iii. 154
 Poggius, ii. 317, 344
 Poiret, Peter, iii. 468

PRE

Poissy, conference of, iii. 16
 Poland, converted, i. 581, 582; Protestant movements in, iii. 136; persecution of the Protestants in, iii. 234; partition of, 441
 Pole, cardinal, ii. 452, 522
 Polish protestantism, iii. 25
 Politian, ii. 500
 Pöllenburg, iii. 428
 Polliac, John de, ii. 271
 Polycarp, martyrdom and epistle of, i. 69, 105; confers about Easter with Anicetus, 136
 Polychronius, i. 25
 Polycrates, resistance, Asiatic, by means of, to pope Victor, i. 136, 180
 Polyglot, London, iii. 401
 Pomerania converted, ii. 89
 Pomponatus, ii. 318, 499
 Pongilupus, ii. 207
 Pontanus, ii. 350
Pontifical Book, the, i. 549
 Pontius, deacon of Carthage, i. 180
 Pope, mode of electing the, ii. 505
 Popery on the British throne a disqualification, iii. 413, 417, 418
 Popes, appointment of, ratified by the emperors, i. 532; ancient election of, ii. 24; change of name when begun by, i. 596; lists of, 615; ii. 591; iii. 629
 Poppo, i. 583
 Porchetus Salvaticus, ii. 293
 Pordage, John, iii. 470
 Porphyry, i. 164, 167
 Porretanus accused of blasphemy, ii. 141
 Porretta, Margaret, ii. 306
 Port Royal, iii. 259
 Porteus, bp., iii. 516
 Portuguese, disputes with the papal court, iii. 251; America conquered by the Dutch, and recovered, 206
 — church, in cent. XIX., iii. 584, 585
 Positive theology, i. 419; theologians, 138
 Possevin, iii. 267; Russian mission of, ii. 552, 553
 Possin, iii. 264
 Potamiæna, martyrdom of, i. 161
 Potamon, alleged founder of the eclectic sect, i. 20
 Pothinus, mission of, to Gaul, i. 97, 119
 Potho, ii. 132
 Potter, abp., iii. 483
 Powder plot, iii. 235
 Prætextatus, jest of, on the ancient opulence of the Roman see, i. 242
 Prætorius, iii. 239, 342
 Pragmatic sanction, ii. 181; 330; abolition of, 376
 Praxeas, i. 152
 Prayer, forms of, used in cent. III., i. 196
 Preaching, rarity of, in England, under Eliz., reasons for, iii. 76
 — friars, ii. 195
 Precedence of the three great sees, i. 168
Precepts and Counsels, i. 128, 419
Precisian, iii. 51
 Predestinarian controversy, i. 563; iii. 9

Predestinarians, i. 383
 Predestination, belief in, not required before the synod of Dort, iii. 29
 Premont , order of, ii. 122
 Presbyter, John, i. 474
 Presbyterian polity, iii. 35
 Presbyterians, account of, iii. 372
 Presbyteries, iii. 18
 Presbyters, primitive, i. 36, 60
 Presbytery, first Scottish, iii. 75
 Prescription, religious rise of an implicit deference for, i. 353; Tertullian's arguments from, 189
 Presence, sacramental, Lutheran, and Zuinglian doctrines of, iii. 6
Preservative against Popery, iii. 412
 President, the primitive, i. 62
 Prester, John, i. 580; ii. 93
 Pretender, the old, birth of, iii. 413; the young, death of, 528
 Prierias, ii. 389
 Priesthood, Christian, assimilated with the Jewish, i. 116
 Priestley, Dr., iii. 512
 Primasius, i. 412, 420
 Primers, the three English, ii. 443
 Printing, invention of, ii. 315, 316
 Priscilla, i. 155
 Priscillian, i. 313
 Priscillianists, the, i. 314
 Priscus Fastidius, i. 347
Privata Monita Soc. Jesu, ii. 514
 Proba, i. 264
 Probabilism, ii. 532
 Procession of the Holy Ghost, i. 513
 Proclus, i. 330, 342, 394
 Procopius, i. 393
 — of Gaza, i. 406
 — Rasa, ii. 354
 Profession, monastic, i. 405
Professors, Jesuitic, ii. 513
 Prometheus, the Demiurge, i. 55
 Promise, monastic, i. 405
Propaganda Fide, de, congregation of, instituted, iii. 183; nature and resources of, 184
 Propagating the faith, seminary of, iii. 183
 Propagation of the Gospel, society for the, instituted, iii. 199, 206
Propheesyings, iii. 59
 Prophets, order of, i. 61; pretended Lutheran, iii. 344
 Propositions, the four French, against the papal court, iii. 254, 255
 Prosper carries on the controversy begun by Augustine, i. 385; his chronicle, 345
 PROTEST, the, ii. 410
 PROTESTANTS, origin of the name, ii. 410
 Provisions, ii. 182, 264
 Prudens of Troyes, i. 548
 Prudentius, account of, i. 263
 Prussia, forced conversion of, ii. 167; church in, in cent. XIX., iii. 579; new liturgy of, 594
 Prussians, iii. 457
 Psalms, David's, introduced into public worship, i. 284

Psathyrians, i. 306
 Ptolemais, capture of, ii. 166
 Ptolomaites, i. 149
 Ptolomy of Lucca, ii. 292
 Publicani, ii. 70; Albi, *ib.*
 Puffendorf, Samuel, iii. 314
 Pullen, or Pullus, Robert, ii. 132
 Purgatory, Platonic origin of a belief in, i. 125; largely indebted to Origen, 183; prevalence of a belief in, 351; Anglo-Saxon views of, ii. 82; synodically affirmed at Florence, 329
 Purification, feast of, i. 426
 Puritan, rise of the name, iii. 51; principles of the party, 19–23; intolerant, 23, 60; doctrinal, 43
 Pythagoras compared with Christ, i. 165
 Pythagoreans, popularity of, among Christians, i. 129

QUADRATUS, bp., i. 123
Quadrivium, i. 329, 415, 485
 Quakers, origin of, iii. 433; publications about them, 434; marked for suppression by Cromwell, 436; protected by James II., 438; tolerated by William III., *ib.*; colonise Pennsylvania, *ib.*; controversies among, 439; apparently a revival of the old mystics, 440; reason for doubting this, 442; their real doctrines, 442, 443; discipline, 446
Qualify, to, iii. 409
 Quarto-decimans, i. 438
 Quedlinburg, convention of, ii. 587
 Quesnel, iii. 273, 277; New Testament of, 476
 Quietists, iii. 288
Quinisext council, i. 460, 470
 Quinquarticularians, iii. 431

RABANUS Maurus, i. 528, 541, 555, 556, 561, 563, 566
 Rabelais, ii. 499
 Racovia (Racow), iii. 162; catechism of, 175, 178
 Radbert, Paschasius, account of, i. 543
 Radbod, i. 474
 Radinus, ii. 352
 Radulphus, Niger, ii. 133
 — de Diceto, ii. 134
 — de Rivo, ii. 297
 Ramism, ii. 563
 Ramus, Peter, *ib.*
 Rance, de, iii. 259
 Ranier, ii. 234
 Ranlin, John, ii. 348
 Ranzovius, iii. 245
 Raskolniks, iii. 298
 Ratherius, bp. i. 591, 602, 612
 Rathmann, Herman, iii. 341
 Rationalism, iii. 592
 Ratisbon, disputation of, iii. 237, 238
 Ratramn, i. 529, 544, 561, 562, 564, 567, 570, ii. 86; the cause of Crammer's abandonment of transubstantiation, ii. 454
 Raymund, de Ageles, ii. 53

RAY

- Raymund, Jordan, ii. 297
 — Sully, ii. 259
 — Martini, ii. 219, 228
 — de Pennafort, ii. 179, 220, 228
 — Sabunde, ii. 234, 238
 — of Toulouse, ii. 345
 Raynald, Oderic, ii. 522
 Raynard, iii. 267
 Rayner, ii. 292
 Readers, iii. 598
 Realists, ii. 19, 107
 Rebellion, Irish, iii. 523
 Reccafrid, i. 525
Recognitions of Clement, i. 67, 190
 Recollets, ii. 519
Recusant, iii. 45
 Red hat granted to cardinals, ii. 676
 Reform Bill, iii. 602
 Reformation by the sword, ii. 245
 Reformed monks, iii. 257
 Régale, iii. 254, 256
Regenerated, used by Justin Martyr for baptised, i. 137
 Regino, i. 546
 Regner Lodbrock, i. 515
 Regular clerks, ii. 519
 Reinboth, iii. 342
 Reinerus Reineccius, ii. 561
 — Sachonus, ii. 221
 Relics, passion for, i. 553; importation of, ii. 11
 Remigius, i. 349, 546; missions of, 390
 — of Auxerre, i. 607
 Remonstrants, iii. 420
 Re-ordination, abp. Bramhall's expedient about, iii. 306
 Reprobation, use of a belief in, i. 383
 Reservations, ii. 181, 264
 Reserved cases, ii. 508
 Restitution edict, iii. 232
 Reuchlin ii. 316, 350, 377
 Reynhard, Martin, ii. 413
 Rheinsburg, iii. 465
 Rheticus, i. 263
 Rhodes, Alexander of, iii. 189
 Rhodon, i. 123
 Ribotus, ii. 296
 Ricci, Laurence, iii. 486
 — Scipio, iii. 492
 — Matthew, ii. 498; iii. 193
 Rich, abp. Edmund, ii. 220
 Richard Cœur de Lion, ii. 12, 97
 — earl of Cornwall, ii. 165
 — of Hexham, ii. 134
 — of St. Victor, ii. 127
 Richelieu, exertions of, to overcome protestant scruples, iii. 238, 243, 244; particulars of, 269
 Richer, Edmund, ii. 527
 Ridley, bp., preaches against images and lustral water, ii. 488; martyred, 453, 454
 Rigordus, ii. 175
 Rignorists, iii. 283
 Riots, the, of 1780, iii. 519
 Rion, bishopric founded, ii. 87

RUP

- Rites, nature of, i. 4; derived from Paganism, 424
 Rites and ceremonies, history of, i. 609.
 Ritual, Jewish, partly borrowed from the Gentiles, i. 29; extensively adopted by Christians, 133
 Riverius, ii. 563
 Riviers, the two, ii. 567
 Rizzio's murder, ii. 429
 Robert, king of France, ii. 71
 — de Monte, ii. 219; duke of Normandy, 8, 10
 — of Paris, ii. 19
 — Retensis, ii. 130
 — of Rheims, ii. 129
 — of St. Marino, ii. 176
 Robinson, John, iii. 368, 370
 Rochelle, capture of, iii. 348
 Rochester, see of, founded, ii. 87
 — John Willmot, earl of, iii. 207
 Roderic, i. 482; the martyr, 524
 — Christopher, ii. 409
 Rodulph of St. Trudo, ii. 130
 Rodulphus Ardens, ii. 129
 Roel, iii. 387, 388
 Rogation days, institution of, i. 360
 Rollo, i. 580
 Roman government, nature of, i. 11; advantages of, *ib.*; see, causes of the ancient pre-eminence of, 242
 Romanism, English toleration of, iii. 520; Irish, hardships inflicted upon, 521; relaxation of them, 522; Scottish toleration of, 524; British, particulars of, 467; conversions to, 612
 Romans, opinions of, as to the universal worshipping of their gods, i. 13
 Rome, primacy conceded to, by Cyprian, i. 168; municipal government of, ii. 182; capture of, in 1527, 408; occupied by Buonaparte's troops, iii. 541; under Gregory XVI., 575; under Pius IX., 576
 Romuald, ii. 43
 Ronge, John, iii. 582
 Rosamond, Juliana, iii. 338
 Rosary or crown of St. Mary, i. 610
 Rosate, Albericus de, ii. 295
 Roscelin, ii. 20, 74
 Rose, bp., iii. 417
 Rosellis, de, ii. 346
 Rosicrucians, iii. 216, 218
 Roskolskika, iii. 298
 Rost, George, iii. 343
 Roswitha, i. 604
 Rosy-cross, iii. 217
 Rota, ii. 506
 Rotterdam, synod of, iii. 361
 Rough, ii. 470
 Roussel, Gerard, ii. 416
 Roxas, Rohas, or Rorhas, iii. 240
 Royal Society, foundation of, iii. 18
 Rudolph of Hapsburg, ii. 188
 Rufinus of Aquileia, i. 262, 281
 Rugen converted, ii. 90
 Ruggieri, iii. 209
 Ruinart, iii. 265
 Rupert of Duytz, ii. 127

RUP

Rupitæ, i. 289
 Ruricius, i. 349
 Russell, Lord John, iii. 550
 Russia converted, i. 522; re-converted, 581; religious parties in, iii. 298; church, in cent. XIX., 571; war of 1852, 566.
 Russians, patriarch of, ii. 544
 Rusticus, i. 416
 — Elpidius, i. 349
 Ruthven, Raid of, iii. 85; earl of, *ib.*, 87
 Ruysbrock, John, ii. 291, 300

SABAS, i. 343

Sabbatarian controversy, the, iii. 56
 Sabbatati, ii. 154
 Sabbath, Christian, i. 78; abolished in France, iii. 495
 Sabellianism, i. 206
 Sabellicus, ii. 349
 Sabellius, i. 205
 Sabians, ii. 549
 Sabinus of Heraclea, i. 341
 Saccas, i. 112
 Saccophori, i. 288
Sacred page, doctors of, ii. 140
Sacrificati, i. 162
 Sacy, iii. 273, 286
 Sadducees, principles of scriptural interpretation holden by, i. 25
 Sadolet, ii. 522
 Sagarellus, ii. 140
 Saint-worship, authority for, in the system of Ammonius Saccas, i. 113
 Saints, importation of, ii. 11
 Saladin, ii. 96
 Salerno, the school of, ii. 16, 103
 Sales, Francis de, canonised, iii. 293
 Salette, La, imposture of, iii. 578.
 Salicetti, iii. 490
 Salomon, the martyr, i. 525
 Salonius, i. 348
 Saltzburgh, protestant emigration from, iii. 478
 Salvian, i. 325, 345; gloomy doctrines of, 358
 Samaritans, religious corruptions of, i. 23
 Samonas, ii. 48
 Samositia, partial conversion of, ii. 312
 Samuel, the Jew, ii. 48
 Sancerft, abp., iii. 381
 Sanctes, Francis, iii. 224
 Sanctius, king of Aragon, ii. 67
 Sand, iii. 464
 Sanders, Nicholas, works and death of, iii. 128; lands in Ireland, ii. 466; issues a letter to the Irish nobility, 130; uncertainty as to the mode of his death, 130
 Sandeus, ii. 350
 Sanhedrim, number of members in the, i. 33
 Sapor, II. *Longævus*, i. 234
Sarabaitæ, i. 274
 Sardica, alleged canon of, in favour of the pope-don, i. 243, 299
 Sarpi, Father Paul, justifies the Venetians, iii. 250; particulars of, 267

SEC

Saturday, kept holy by some primitive Christians, i. 79; occasional religious use of, 135
 Saturninus, i. 142, 160
 Satzburchers, emigration of, iii. 312
 Saurin, iii. 484
 Saville, Sir George, iii. 518
 Savonarola, ii. 340
 Savoy conference, iii. 404
 Saxo Grammaticus, ii. 347
 Saxons, forcible conversion of, ii. 83
 Saybrook platform, iii. 371
 Scacchi, iii. 268
 Scandinavia converted, i. 420
Scapular, ii. 199
 Scepticism, rise of, ii. 168
 Sceptics, modern, iii. 224
 Schade, iii. 331, 339
 Schaden, ii. 365
 Schall, John Adam, iii. 191
 Scharf, iii. 324
 Schelling, iii. 590
 Schenck, James, ii. 574
 Schertzer, iii. 319
 Schism, papal, ii. 268; tabular view of, iii. 584; act, 497
 Schleiermacher, iii. 592
 Schmidt, Conrad, ii. 574
 Scholarius, ii. 336
 Scholastic theology, origin of, i. 184; first compendium of, 188; first taught by the Irish, 506; brought into general use by the Berengarian controversy, ii. 56
 Scholastics, Romish, ii. 528
 Schomann, iii. 174
 Schomer, iii. 318, 320
 Schönefeld, Henry, ii. 365
 School divinity, rise of, ii. 139
 Schools, early Christian, i. 108; public in cent. V., 344
 Schurmann, iii. 467
 Schwenckfeld, ii. 570, 571
 Schwestriones, ii. 241
 Scioppius, iii. 245
 Scot, John, i. 529, 545, 564
 Scotists, ii. 300
 Scotland, protestant movements in, ii. 418; ecclesiastical movements of James I. in, after the English accession, iii. 372; of Charles I., *ib.*; ecclesiastical polity of, iii. 35; episcopacy overthrown in, 416; free church of, 492; primates of, ii. 597; eucharistic controversy in, iii. 623; *Veto Act* in, 625; Free Church of, 626
 Scottish reformation legally established, ii. 491; unfavourable circumstances of, 494
 Scripture, alleged double sense of, i. 125, 187; various senses of, 555; English translations of, ii. 442; authorised version of, undertaken, iii. 394
 Seythian monks, opinion of, i. 423
 Seabury, bp., iii. 530, 531
 Sebastian, king, iii. 127
 Secker, abp., iii. 529
 Secret doctrine, i. 75
Secreta Monita, ii. 514

SEC

Sects, English enumeration of, in the *Gangræna*, ii. 503
 Secundians, i. 149
 Sedulius, i. 348, 547, 554
 Sees, Irish, among the Romanists, filled by the Stuarts, iii. 466
 Seidelius, iii. 346
 Seidenbecher, iii. 346
 Seleucia, synods of, i. 372; patriarch of, 428
 Self-taxation relinquished by the English clergy, iii. 407
 Selnecker, ii. 584
 Seltam Segued, iii. 247
 Semi-Arians, i. 307
 — Pelagians, i. 385
 — Universalists, iii. 356
 — Judaizers, iii. 346
 Seminaries, the, iii. 47
 Senator, i. 415; Roman, nature of the, 182
 Sendomir, agreement of, iii. 26
 Seneca, John, ii. 221
 Sentences, book of, ii. 139
Sententiarii, ii. 129
 Separation, puritanical, the, iii. 51
 Septuagint, legendary account of, i. 118. extravagant veneration for, 126
 Sequenot, iii. 268
 Serapion, i. 165, 256
 — bishop of Antioch, i. 123
 — the Armenian patriarch, ii. 509
 Serenus Granianus, interference of, favourable to Christianity, i. 104
 — of Marseilles, i. 507
 Sergius of Constantinople, i. 452, 465
 Serignam, Peter of, ii. 204
 Serrarius, iii. 267
Servant of the servants of God, origin of the papal style, i. 400
 Servants of the ever-blessed Virgin, ii. 191
 Servatus Lupus, i. 531, 543
 Servetus, iii. 163
 Servian church, iii. 571
 Service, divine, in the primitive church, i. 79
 Sethites, i. 150
 Sevenfold grace of the Spirit, i. 567
 Seven liberal arts, the, i. 329
 Seventh day Baptists, iii. 460
 Seventy disciples, i. 33, 58
 Severians, i. 428
 Severianus, i. 341
 Severinus, ii. 563
 Severus, persecution under, i. 106
 — the heretic, i. 143
 — of Minorca, i. 319
 — the Monophysite, i. 408, 428
 Sextus, i. 123
 Sfondrati, Celestine, iii. 255, 268
 Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley Cooper, earl of, iii. 208
 Sharp, abp., iii. 411
 Shepherd, Thomas, iii. 203
 Sherlock, bp., iii. 530
 Shermius, i. 479
 Shiites, i. 445
 Shorter, sir John, iii. 413

SOM

Siam, embassy of Lewis XIV. to, iii. 190; Romanism in, 191
 Sibour, archbp., iii. 579
 Sibthorp, iii. 397
 Sibylline verses, i. 130
 Sicilies, two, kingdom of, instituted of, ii. 24
 Sicily gained by the Saracens, i. 524, ii. 4
 Sidonius Apollinaris, i. 346
 Sienienus, iii. 170
 Siffred of Meissen, ii. 293
 Sigan, i. 433
 Sigebert, Gemblacensis, ii. 129
 Sigerie, ii. 84, 87
 Sigfrid, ii. 52
 Sigismund, the emperor, ii. 323
 Silvester, Syropulus, ii. 338
 Simeon, bp. of Jerusalem, martyrdom of, i. 103
 — Stylites, i. 357
 — of Durham, ii. 131
 — Magister, ii. 125
 — Stylites, jun., ii. 410
 — of Thessalonica, ii. 335
 — a general name of one class of Nestorian patriarchs, ii. 549
 Simon Magus, i. 86
 — of Crete, ii. 214
 — de Montfort, ii. 239
 — Richard, iii. 266
 — C. H. de St., iii. 578
 Simony, i. 600: ii. 31
 Simplicius, i. 394
 — Pope, 349
 Sinfulness charged upon the Com. Prayer, iii. 405
 Siricius, decretal epistles of, i. 265
 Sirmond, iii. 264
 Sisebutus, i. 455
 Sisi, ii. 547
 Sisinnius, i. 603
 Sisters of charity, iii. 261
 Six articles, act of, ii. 428, 447
 Sixtus, bp. of Rome, martyrdom of, i. 163
 — II., i. 180: epistles of, 348
 — IV., ii. 332
 — V., ii. 516
 — of Sienna, ii. 523
 Slavonians forcibly converted, ii. 91
 Smalcald, league of, ii. 423; war of, 430
 Smerwick, iii. 129
 Smyth, John, iii. 157
Société Catholique, iii. 584
 Societies, religious, in cent. XIX., iii. 609
 Socinianism, iii. 168, 177
 Socinians, history of, in cent. XVII., iii. 460; driven from Poland, 462, 532; tolerated in Transylvania, 485
 Socinus, Lælius, iii. 161, 168, 175
 — Faustus, iii. 161, 174
 Socrates, Scholasticus, i. 342
 Sogdiana, i. 473
 Sohner, iii. 461
Solares, ii. 551
 Solitaries, i. 288
 Solomon of Constance, i. 550
 Somasquo, Fathers of, ii. 520
 Somner, John, iii. 181

Somites, i. 445
Sophia, the Abon, i. 148, 151
Sophia, the electress, iii. 419
 Sophronius, i. 451, 464
 the friend of Jerome, i. 256
 Sorbonne, the, ii. 173
 Robert de, *ib.*, 221
 Sozzini, iii. 161
 Spain, protestants in, ii. 416; church in, in cent. XIX., iii. 584.
 Spanheim, Frederic, iii. 383
 Spener, iii. 318, 320, 321, 329, 334
 Spenerian, iii. 333
 Sperber, iii. 217, 218
 Spherical god of Mahomet, ii. 144
 Spilsbury, iii. 460
 Spina, Alphonsus, ii. 341, 342
 Spinoza, iii. 210
 Spire, diet of, in 1526, ii. 407; in 1529, 409
Spiritual, the, ii. 201, 203
 Spirituals, the, iii. 40
 Spondanus, ii. 522
 Sponsors, ancient authority for, i. 137
 Spottiswood admitted Superintendent, ii. 486
 archbp., iii. 632
 Sprenger, ii. 350
 St. Amour, William de, ii. 198
 St. John, Christians of, i. 25
 — feast of, i. 426
 St. Thomas' Christians, i. 372
 Stancarus, ii. 580
 States General, meeting of, iii. 494
 Stations, i. 425
 Stattorius, Peter, iii. 170
 Statues, late introduction of, into churches, i. 507
 Stedingers, ii. 234
 Stella, ii. 351
 Stenonius, iii. 245
 Stephen, bishop of Rome, i. 180; has a controversy with Cyprian, 169; rashness of, 168
 — II., i. 490, 501
 — III., i. 502
 — V., i. 549
 — IX., ii. 52
 — of Augsburg, ii. 130
 — the Hungarian saint, i. 582
 — of Liege, i. 604, 608
 — of Tournay, i. 134
 Stercorianism, i. 562, 563
 Stero, ii. 292
Stigmata of St. Francis, ii. 197, 274, 275
 — festival of, ii. 304
 Stock, Simon, ii. 199
 Stoics' views of the Deity, i. 20
 Strasburg, Thomas of, ii. 291
 Strauss's *Leben Jesu*, iii. 596
 Strigel, Victorin, iii. 337
 Strigolnieks, iii. 298
 Stuart, Robert, bishop of Caithness, iii. 70
 Stubbs, Thomas, ii. 296
 Studites, i. 360
 Stukeley, iii. 127
 Sturmius, St., i. 479
 Stylianus, i. 541

Stylites, i. 356
 Suatopluc, i. 522
 Subchal Jesu, i. 473
 Subdeacons, i. 170
Subintroductæ mulieres, i. 171
 Subordinationists, i. 307
 Subscription, petition against, iii. 514; not generally exacted from Dissenters, 515; relief granted, from their liability to a call for it, 516
 Sueno, i. 584
 Suevi, conversion of, i. 321
 Suidas, i. 602
 Sulaka, ii. 510
 Sulpitius Severus, i. 262
 Sunday kept in cent. I., i. 78; religious application of, 136; enjoined by Constantine, 285
Συνοδᾶκτοι, i. 171
 Supererogation, works of, rise of a belief in, ii. 137
 Superintendents appointed in Scotland, ii. 485
 Suppression of monastic orders in cent. XVII., iii. 256
 Supralapsarians, iii. 354
 Supremacy, royal, conceded in England, ii. 428; act of, 458; real import of, iii. 32; passed in Ireland, 112, 118; submission to, of the chiefs, 112, 113
 Surlius, ii. 522
 Susneius, iii. 247
 Suso, ii. 244
 Sussex, conversion of, i. 441
 Sweden, reformation of, ii. 411; church in, in cent. XIX., iii. 598
 Switzerland, church in, in cent. XIX., iii. 583, 599
 Sylvester II., i. 592, 602; originates the idea of a crusade, 585
 Symbolical books, the Lutheran, ii. 557
 Symeon Stylites instrumental in the conversion of the Syrian mountaineers, i. 320, 410
 Symmachus, i. 180, 349; contest about the election of, 402
 Synagogues, i. 29
 Syncellus, George, i. 497
 Syncretism, iii. 326
 Syncretistic, iii. 322
Synecdemi, i. 576
 Synergistic controversy, ii. 576
 Synesius, i. 237, 341
 Synod, holy legislative, iii. 300
 Syria, Druses and Maronites' struggle in, iii. 567
 Syricius of Barcelona, i. 455
 Systematic theology taught among the Greeks, i. 506
 Szegedin, ii. 28

TABOR, ii. 353
 Taborites, ii. 356
 Taboritic light, ii. 305
 Tachard, iii. 190
 Tajo, i. 447, 455, 458
 Tambacus, John, ii. 297

TAM

- Tamerlane, ii. 251
 Tanistry, iii. 110, 122
 Tanquelin, ii. 152
 Tarasius, i. 501, 511
 Tarnovius, iii. 317, 319, 342
 Tartars, conversion of, i. 473
 Tartary, Christian reverses in, ii. 100
 Tate, i. 440
 Tatian, *Apology* of, i. 105, 123, 125; opinions of, 144
 Tatianists, i. 145
 Tauler, John, ii. 291, 300
 Taurellus, ii. 501
 Tausson, ii. 513
 Telling, William, iii. 39
 Templars, the, ii. 98; suppressed, 265, 309
 Temple of Reason, iii. 496
 Temples, Christian, doubts as to the existence of, in primitive times, i. 79
 Terminists, ii. 318
Tertiarii, ii. 208
 Tertullian, account of, i. 121, 126, 127; a Montanist, 157; an authority for crossing 197
 Test Act, iii. 408; unsuccessful attempt for the repeal of, under William III., 414; contemplated repeal of, by Walpole, 498; allowed by him to continue, 499; further movements to obtain its repeal, 516; repealed, 550.
Tetrapla, Origen's, i. 185
 Tetrapolitan Confession, ii. 421
 Tetzel, ii. 385, 387, 388
 Teutonic knights, ii. 98, 312; military missions of, ii. 167
 Thalassius, i. 452, 458
Theandric, i. 464
 Theatins, ii. 519
 Theatrical pieces represented in churches, ii. 231
 Theganus, i. 548
 Themistius, i. 231, 430
 Theodelinda, i. 426
 Theodora, i. 575
 Theodore I., pope, i. 455
 — archbishop, i. 447, 456, 458, 489; ii. 77, 78
 — of Heraclea, i. 255
 — of Mopsuestia, i. 339; his commentaries, 352
 — of Pharan, i. 452
 — of Raithu, i. 452, 458
 Theodoret, particulars and works of, i. 338; commentaries of, 352
 Theodoric, i. 319; calls a council to decide upon the case of Symmachus, 402, 403
 — de Apoldia, i. 222
 — Engeltrusius, ii. 345
 — of St. Trudo, ii. 129
 Theodorus of Heraclea, i. 255
 — Abucara, i. 540
 — Grappus, *ib.*
 — of Iconium, i. 411
 — Lector, i. 410
 — Studites, i. 540, 557
 — bishop of Antioch, i. 611
 Theodosius, zealous for Christianity, i. 229;

TIT

- assembles the council of Constantinople, 244; debarred from Christian privileges by Ambrose, 258; legislates against the Arians, 305
 Theodosius the younger, penal laws of, against paganism, i. 320
 — of Edessa, i. 515
 Theodotus, i. 152, 153
 — of Ancyra, i. 340
 Theoduin, ii. 52.
 Theodulph, i. 501
 Theognostus, i. 181, 188
 Theonas, i. 263
 Theopaschites, i. 376
 Theophanes, i. 497, 540
 — of Byzantium, i. 411
 — Ceramens, ii. 48
 — of Nice, ii. 288
 Theophilanthropists, iii. 496
 Theophilus, of Alexandria, i. 256, 282, 338
 — of Antioch, i. 120, 126
 — the emperor, i. 558
 — the Maronite patriarch, i. 520
 Theophylact Simocatta, i. 452
 — of Bulgaria, ii. 48
 — of Constantinople, i. 594
 — Theorianus, ii. 125
 Theosophist, the German, iii. 343
 Theosophists, ii. 502; iii. 217
 Therapeutæ, i. 27
 Theresa, St., ii. 519
 Theudas, a pretended Gnostic authority, i. 85
 Theurge, Christ pronounced an admirable, by Ammonius Saccas, i. 113
 Theurgy, *ib.*
 Thiers, Jo. Bapt., iii. 270
 Thirlby, bp., ii. 459
 Thirty years' war, iii. 231
 Thomas of Heraclea, i. 457
 — St., alleged mission of, to China, i. 434
 Thomasius, Christian, iii. 314, 317
 — king Stephen, ii. 361
 Thomassio, iii. 266
 Thomists, ii. 300
 Thorn, conference of, iii. 237, 238, 310, 325
 — William, ii. 297
 Threefold manner of treating theology, i. 419
 Thundering Legion, the, i. 100
Thurificati, i. 162
 Thuringians, conversion of, i. 391, 475, 476
 Tiberias, battle of, ii. 96
 Tiberius, alleged proposal of, to enrol Christ among the gods, i. 39
 Tillemont, iii. 266
 Tillotson, abp., iii. 379, 381, 415
 Timotheus, i. 459
 — of Alexandria, i. 410
 — of Constantinople, i. 403
 — the Nestorian pontiff, i. 473
 Timothy, particulars of, i. 39
 Timur Beg, ii. 251
Tisserandi, ii. 157
 Titelmann, ii. 527
 Titular dignities, assumption of titles from, by Romanists, made penal, iii. 555

TIT

- Tituli*, i. 283
 Titus of Bostra, i. 256
 — particulars of, i. 39
 Todiscus, ii. 352
 Toland, John, iii. 208, 211
 Tolentino, peace of, iii. 497
 Toleration, Act of, iii. 414; refused by the Presbyterians, 375
 Töllner, iii. 589
 Tonquin, Romanism in, iii. 189
 Tonsure, differences of, ii. 78
 Torgau, alliance of, ii. 407; articles of, 411; convention of, 582; book of, 583
 Torquemada, ii. 342
 Tostatus, ii. 339
 Toul, council of, i. 566
 Tournon, iii. 472
Tracts for the Times, iii. 605
 Tradition, Jewish, i. 25; Anglican view of, iii. 30, 105
 Traditors, i. 215
 Trajan, general character of, i. 93; his answers to Pliny, *ib.*; evils to the Christians under, 103
 Transcription, monastic services in, i. 397
 Transfiguration, feast of, ii. 360
 Transmigration of souls, i. 55
 Transubstantiation unknown in cent. VII., i. 458; branded as a novelty and an error by Raban Maur, 542; at variance with Druthmar, 553, 544; rejected by the Anglo-Saxons, ii. 83; doubted in century XII., 145; various opinions upon, i. 605; synodically decreed at the Lateran, 223; Greek adhesion to, iii. 297
 Transylvania, Protestantism in, iii. 97, 98
 Trapezuntius, ii. 337
 Trappe, la, iii. 259
 Trent, council of, proposed by the pope, ii. 429; negotiations in its favour by the emperor, *ib.*; first assemblies, 430; obtains the assent of the diet at Augsburg to it, 511; transferred to Bologna, *ib.*; papal consent gained for reviving the council at Trent, 432; protestant deputies set out for it, 433; decrees the use of Latin in public worship, 448; participation in it refused by Queen Elizabeth, 463; conclusion of its sessions, 464; Congregation for interpreting its decrees, 533; its obscurities, 524; interferes against Romish conformity in England, iii. 45
 Treves, holy coat of, iii. 582
 Tribonianus, i. 393
 Trinity, alleged first mention of the word in the Fathers, i. 120
 — college, Dublin, foundation of, iii. 135
 — holy brethren of, ii. 192
 Triphilus of Ledris, i. 255
Trisagius, i. 376
 Trithemism, charge of, i. 567
 — i. 431
 Trithemius, ii. 316, 349
 Trivet, Nicholas, ii. 293
Trivium, i. 329, 415, 485; ii. 17
 Trophimus, the missionary, i. 160
 Tropological sense of Scripture, i. 504

URB

- Truchess, count, ii. 559
True law of Free Monarchies, iii. 104
Trullo, concilium in, i. 460, 470
 Truth distinguished into philosophical and theological, ii. 318
 Tryers, the, iii. 377
 Tryphon, i. 180
 Tudeschus, Nicolaus, ii. 345
Tulchan, iii. 69
 Tunstall, Cuthbert, preaches against the papacy, ii. 444; deprived, 451
 Turks, the first appearance of, i. 482; converted to Mahometanism, 586
 Turlupins, ii. 241
 Turrecremata, ii. 342
 Turrianus, ii. 522
 Tychicus, ii. 147
 Tycho Brahe, iii. 213
 Tychonius, i. 265
 Tyndale, William, ii. 442
Typus, ii. 466
 Tyrannicide, advocated and condemned, ii. 326
 Tythes, Christian, origin of, i. 117
- UBERTINUS, de Cassalis, ii. 293
 Ubiquity, ii. 586; iii. 10
 Uckewallists, iii. 457
 Udal, death of, iii. 62
 Udalrich, canonisation of, i. 607
 Uke Wales, iii. 457
 Ulphilas, scriptural versions of, i. 160, 232; embassy of, 306
 Ulric of Strasburg, ii. 222
 Ulrich of Augsburg, i. 549, 553
Unam Sanctam, ii. 261
 Uncatholic popery, iii. 238
 Uction, extreme, use of, in primitive times, i. 81
 Understanding, men of, ii. 364
 Uniats, iii. 565, 572
 Uniformity, act of, deprivations by, under Charles II., iii. 378, 380; passed in Ireland, 188, 407
Unigenitus, Bull, iii. 253, 475, 476, 487
 Unitarians, ineffectual motion for the relief of, iii. 517
 — Polish edicts against, iii. 169; differences among, *ib.*
 United brethren, iii. 27
 — Greeks, ii. 552
 Unity of human souls, i. 567
Universal Bishop, title of, given to the bishop of Constantinople, i. 490
 Universalists, iii. 356
 Universals, i. 592
 Universities, rise of, ii. 103, 173; Romish, answers of, iii. 520
 Unleavened bread, ii. 60
 Unreformed monks, iii. 257
 Ununited Greeks, ii. 552
 Uranius, i. 398
 Urban II., i. 610; ii. 5, 6, 9, 40
 — III., ii. 118, 134
 — IV., ii. 188, 221
 — V., ii. 267

URB

Urban VI., ii. 268, 269
 — VIII., i. 456, 481, 498
 Urgel, Felix of, i. 513, 517
 Ursicinus, i. 243
 Ursinus, Zechariah, iii. 14
 Urspergensis, ii. 176
 Ursulines, ii. 520
 Ussher, James, admission of, to Trin. Coll.,
 Dublin, iii. 135; accepts the Jesuit's chal-
 lenge, 135; Predestinarian principles of, 396
 Usuardus, i. 549
 Utino, ii. 346.

VALENCE, council of, i. 565

Valens, the emperor, instrumental in the
 conversion of the Goths, i. 232
 Valentinus, i. 148; his principles, *ib.*
 Valerian, variable conduct of, towards the
 Christians, i. 163
 Valerianus, i. 348
 Valerius, i. 456
 Valla, Lawrence, ii. 345, 356
Vallischolares, ii. 191
 Vallombrosa, ii. 44
 Van Mildert, bp., iii. 559
 Van Swieten, iii., 486
 Vandals, the, uncertain date of the conversion
 of, i. 305, 322
 Vanini, iii. 209
 Vararanes, persecution of, i. 326
 Vargas, Alphonsus, ii. 295
 Vassi, outrage at, iii. 16, 17
 Vatablus, ii. 522
 Veccus, ii. 213
Vedas, the, i. 52
 Vendome, Matthew de, ii. 174
 Venial sins, what, ii. 532
 Venice, protestant congregation at, iii. 251
 Verger de Hauranne, iii. 277
 Veri, Anthony, iii. 472
 Veronius, iii. 242
 Verschoor, iii. 390
 Vessels, eucharistic, costly, used in cent. III.,
 i. 195
 Vestry-cess, iii. 602
 Vesture-controversy, the, iii. 50
Veto, the, iii. 523
 Vicelin, ii. 92
 Victor, bp. of Rome, intemperate conduct of,
 about Easter, i. 136; his works lost, 123
 — II., ii. 23
 — III., ii. 405
 — IV., ii. 113
 — of Antioch, i. 341, 352
 — of Capua, i. 416
 — of Tunis, *ib.*
 — Vitensis, i. 349
 Victor-Emmanuel, iii. 586
 Victorinus, i. 181, 187, 264, 348, 349
 Vienne, general council of, ii. 264
 Vigerus, ii. 352
 Vigilantius, i. 357
 Vigilus Tapsensis, i. 346
 Vigilus, pope, i. 416, 422

WAT

Vigils, abuse of, i. 286
 Viles, John Baptist, iii. 184
 Villanovanus, iii. 163
 Vincent of Beauvais, ii. 175
 — Lerins, particulars and works of, i. 346
 — de Paul, iii. 261
 Vincentius Ferrarius, ii. 341
 Vinesauf, Galfrid, ii. 134
Vineyards, ii. 211
 Viret, iii. 11
 Virgilius, i. 479
 Virgin Mary, worship of, i. 610
 Virgins of love, iii. 261
 Visconti, iii. 270
 Visitation, Lutheran, of the Saxon states, in
 1526, ii. 409
 Vitalian, pope, i. 455, 467; ii. 77
 Vitalise Furno, ii. 293
 Vitellius, i. 263
 Vitriaco, James de, ii. 176
 Vivaldus, ii. 350
 Vives, *ib.*
 Voet, Gilbert or Gisbert, iii. 52, 383, 384
 Voetians, iii. 352, 383
 Voidovius, iii. 176
 Volusian, persecution under, i. 163
 Volusius, iii. 239
 Voragine, James de, ii. 176
 Vorilongus, ii. 347
 Vorstius, iii. 428
 Vortigern, i. 326
 Vowel points, Hebrew, iii. 359
 Vulgate, the origin of, i. 268
 — decree at Trent, in favour of, ii. 526

WAKE, abp., iii. 500; opinion of, upon epis-
 copacy, 483; his negociation for an union
 with the French church, *ib.*
 Walafrid Strabo, i. 544, 554, 559, 570
 Waldemar I., ii. 90
 Walden, Thomas of, ii. 344
 Waldenses, early notice of, i. 449; in Northern
 Germany, ii. 361; side with Calvin, iii. 97;
 persecuted in cent. XVII., 234, 350; pro-
 tected by Cromwell, 401
 Waldo, Peter, ii. 154
 Walenburg, iii. 243
 Walleis, Thomas, ii. 294, 301
 Wallis, John, iii. 223
 Walpole, sir Robert, iii. 499; exaction of, upon
 papists and non-jurors, 518
 Walsh, bp., iii. 119
 Walsingham, ii. 345
 Walther, iii. 317, 319
 Walton, Brian, iii. 401
 Wansleben, iii. 301
 Warburton, unfair picture of Paganism by, i. 19
 Warham, abp., remonstrates against the proposed
 marriage of Henry VIII. with Catharine of
 Aragon, ii. 428; concedes the supremacy, *ib.*
 Wartburg, castle of, Luther conveyed to, ii. 398
 Waterlanders, iii. 458, 459
 Waterlandians, iii. 137, 148
 Watson, William, iii. 47

WAY

- Wayen, Van der, iii. 383
 Weigel, ii. 564; iii. 343
 Weissenburg, disputation at, iii. 175
 Weller, ii. 567; iii. 318, 319, 324
 Wellington, duke of, iii. 551
 Wels, baron of, iii. 199
 Welsh language, iii. 119, 120
 Wendelbert, i. 548
 Wernerus de Laer, ii. 349
 Wertheim translation, iii. 48
 Wesleyans, iii. 603
 Wesleys, the, iii. 503, 504
 Wesselius, ii. 340
 Wessex, conversion of, i. 440
 West Indian episcopacy, iii. 558
 Westminster, see of, ii. 87
 Westphal, controversy on the presence, revived by, iii. 8
 Westphalia, peace of, iii. 233
 Wetstein, iii. 428
 Wette, De, iii. 600
 Whichcot, John, iii. 379
 Whiston, iii. 157, 485
 Whitby, conference of, i. 439
 White, bishop of Winchester, ii. 461
 — brethren, ii. 363
 — Thomas, iii. 291
 Whitefield, iii. 484, 507
 Whitgift, abp., attacks Cartwright, iii. 53; sanctions the Lambeth articles, 55; patronises Hooker, 56; his habits and character, 60; opinion of, upon polity, 36
 Wickes, Thomas, ii. 223
 Wickliffe, ii. 271; condemned at Constance, 325
 Widekind, i. 480
 Wighard, ii. 77
 Wilfrid, i. 441, 449; ii. 77, 81
 Wilhelmina, ii. 245
 Willelmus, ii. 52
 William III., iii. 236
 — of Auxerre, ii. 128
 — the Conqueror, ii. 16, 21
 — his reply to Gregory VII., ii. 29
 — of Malmesbury, ii. 85, 131
 — of Rheims, ii. 127
 — of St. Amour, ii. 218
 — de Seligniac, ii. 219
 — of Tyre, ii. 133
 Williams, Roger, iii. 460
 Willibald, i. 479, 501
 Willibrand of Oldenburgh, ii. 220
 Willibrord, account of, i. 436
 Wimpelingius, ii. 350
 Winifrid. See Boniface
 Winnock, St., i. 481
 Wishart, martyrdom of, iii. 18
Witnesses of the Truth, ii. 54
 Wittekind, i. 591
 Wlodimir, i. 581
 Wolf, philosophy of, iii. 588
Wolfenbüttel Fragments, iii. 591

ZWE

- Wolfgang, William, iii. 244
 Wolfhardus, i. 549
 Wolsey, cardinal, obtains a bull for the suppression of certain monasteries, ii. 445
 Wolstan, ii. 84
 Woodford, or Wilford, William of, ii. 297
 Worms, appearance of Luther at, ii. 398
 — *concordat* of, ii. 111
 — conference of, ii. 429
 Worship, apostolic, i. 37; primitive Christian, i. 79, 135
 — public, times for, in cent. III., i. 194
 Wulfilaicus, i. 357
 Wulfine, ii. 84
 Württemberg, church in, in cent. XIX., iii. 580

XAVIER, Francis, ii. 497

- Xenaias, i. 430
 Xenias, i. 379
 Ximenes, Cardinal, ii. 351
 — Francis, ii. 298
 Ximenius, Roderic, ii. 175
 Xiphilin, ii. 48
 Xun-Chi, iii. 191

YORK, Frederick, duke of, iii. 548

ZABARELLA, Francis, ii. 298

- Zaccagni, iii. 269
 Zachæus, i. 348
 Zacharias, Antony Mavia, i. 198
 — of Chrysopolis, ii. 133
 — pope, i. 490, 501
 — the rhetorician, i. 348
 — Scholasticus, i. 410
 Zamora, ii. 352
 Zanchius, Jerome, iii. 8
 Zani, conversion of, i. 389
Zealous, the, ii. 200
 Zeno of Verona, i. 264
Zeno's Henoticon, i. 377
 Zeuser, Adam, iii. 176
 Zingha, Anna, iii. 202
 Zinzendorf, iii. 479
 Ziska, ii. 354
 Zonaras, John, ii. 102, 123
 Zoroaster, date of, i. 54; doctrine of, professedly restored by Manes, i. 200
 Zosimus, the historian, statement of, about Constantine's conversion, i. 219; character of, as an author, 327
 — bp. of Rome, notice of, i. 347; wavers about Pelagianism, 382
 Zuingle, ii. 466; eucharistic doctrine of, 402, 422; iii. 10, 13; attends the conference of Marburg, 411; satisfies Luther as to his general orthodoxy, *ib.*; his opinion of his divine decrees, iii. 8; death, ii. 404; iii. 6
 Zuinglian Confession, ii. 421
 Zwentibold, i. 522





